

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



Regulations Regarding Theses and Dissertations

[illegible]

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE ALEXANDER-PORTRAIT IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE

by

Gregor Gustav Roetker



A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts

Department of Classics

Edmonton, Alberta

September, 1967

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and that they recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled

THE ALEXANDER-PORTRAIT IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE

submitted by Gregor Gustav Roetker in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

Alexander the Great left, as his legacy, the concept of monarchical and universal rule and the portrait of himself as a conqueror and the founder of a new epoch of history. The recipients of this legacy were the Romans. New experiences and ideas, provided during the Early Empire, influenced the Romans in their view of Alexander at that time.

The purpose of this study was to discover and trace the varying interpretations of Alexander by the Romans during this period and to understand the causes and effects of such views regarding one of the most remarkable careers in history. The Greek and Latin sources which were considered were those which revealed the Roman attitude towards Alexander.

The development of imperial rule in Rome stimulated interest in Alexander. The Macedonian king served as a model and a basis of comparison for the emerging imperial tradition in Rome.

References in Roman authors indicate that Alexander's name was well known to the Romans. His achievements provided a favoured background against which the success of Rome and her leaders could be measured. The parochial nature of Roman historical writing discouraged extensive and intensive evaluations of Alexander within the framework of a universal history.

Criticism of Alexander did not have its beginning in Rome. It reaches back into Hellenistic times and originated mainly within the different philosophical schools. Its strongest Roman appearance is to

be found in the writings of Seneca and Lucan. Since Roman emperors had identified themselves with Alexander, the Alexander-critique of the two Roman authors casts reflections on them as well.

The work of Curtius Rufus presents philosophical and psychological rather than new historical insight. This evaluation cannot be called a typically Roman approach to the person of Alexander. It is an attempt to understand and describe Alexander as a leader in whom greatness and weakness had waged a strong battle.

During the period of the Early Roman Empire Alexander presented many different images to the Romans and his memory served different purposes. Throughout the period, however, his name and his achievements were remembered and discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. THE ALEXANDER-IDEOLOGY AND THE EMPERORS	4
Alexander in the Augustan Age	7
Alexander and the Successors of Augustus	19
II. ALEXANDER IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE EARLY EMPIRE	28
III. ALEXANDER IN THE RHETORICAL TRADITION OF THE EARLY EMPIRE	45
IV. ALEXANDER IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITION	53
V. ALEXANDER-CRITICISM IN SENECA AND LUCAN	68
Seneca	68
Lucan	78
VI. THE ALEXANDER-PORTRAIT OF QUINTUS CURTIUS RUFUS	90
CONCLUSION	116
BIBLIOGRAPHY	121

INTRODUCTION

The personality and achievements, the motives and ambitions of Alexander the Great have always attracted the interest of writers and the searching study of scholars. The Macedonian King has been looked upon as an "agent of history's own dreams"¹ by enthusiastic biographers and has been presented by historians as a case-study in their debate on whether history makes men or men make history. Most historians cannot help but see Alexander through the eyes of their contemporary experience, and they have been frequently conditioned by a specific political ideology or philosophy of history. To their regret some of them have found that in ancient times Alexander had not been discussed in their specific terms and concepts. They did, however, find that during most of the periods of antiquity that followed Alexander's death some discussion on Alexander had taken place. The attention and the interest that Alexander commanded in antiquity may seldom have resulted in an extensive and objective historical presentation of his personality and achievements; for he was present not only as a memory but also as a symbol.

This study is concerned with the portrait of Alexander that had been adopted or was being drawn during the Early Roman Rmpire.

'Portrait' in this context means the description of Alexander based upon the conception of him and the attitude towards him during this

¹Compare the theme of the very recent biography of Alexander: J. Benoist-Mechin, Alexander the Great, New York, 1966. This edition is the English translation of the French original which was published in Switzerland in 1964 under the title, Alexandre le Grand.

particular period. For our purpose it is not always necessary to mark clearly the distinction between the Alexander as he had really been and the idea that he had become. We shall not find that a single view of Alexander prevailed at this time. It is to be expected that--because of the difference in ideas and dominant motives--different aspects of Alexander and the Alexander-tradition came into focus during this period. The emphasis in this study is not, therefore, on the historical Alexander but on the interests that his memory and image served and on the ideological framework within which he was seen--or even pressed.

The period investigated in this study is that of the Early Roman Empire extending from 30 B.C. to about 100 A.D. and covering the reigns of Augustus, of his Julio-Claudian successors and of the Flavian emperors. During this time two important Latin works on Alexander and his achievements were written. Pompeius Trogus, whose account has come down to us only in form of Justin's Epitome, wrote about Alexander within the framework of his Historiae Philippicae. Quintus Curtius Rufus on the other hand dealt in the ten books of his Historiae Alexandri Magni exclusively with the life and exploits of Alexander.¹

The object of this study will be, in fact, the 'Roman' portrait of Alexander as distinct from that among the Greeks of this period. The evidence is taken mainly from literary sources. Other evidence will be used, however, to reinforce conclusions, to underline important aspects and to provide points of comparison.

¹The time during which Q. Curtius Rufus wrote is debated. A discussion of this question will follow later.

At the beginning of the Augustan age Alexander was by no means unknown to the Romans and certain concepts of him had evolved.¹ Political changes, however, of the sort that characterize the Early Roman Empire, especially the development of the emperor's position into one of singular power, provided new experiences and ideas, which influenced the Roman concept of Alexander. The first part of this study deals mainly with the Roman interpretation of Alexander based on these new experiences and ideas. A second part is concerned with the Alexander-tradition as it was discussed, adopted or possibly modified during the time of the Early Empire. This tradition can be thought of as having arrived in three different streams, whose close relationship with each other, however, must be noted. In a third part the concept of Alexander in Seneca and Lucan and the Alexander-portrait of Quintus Curtius Rufus will be discussed. Seneca's and Lucan's writings contain very similar statements of extreme hostility towards Alexander. Q. Curtius' Historiae is the only work in Latin that has come down to us which is devoted exclusively to a description of the life and exploits of Alexander. In the discussion of the Alexander portrait in Seneca, Lucan and Curtius, the presumed influence of the rhetorical and philosophical Alexander-tradition will be questioned.

¹The relationship between Alexander and the Romans has been studied by W. Hoffmann, Das literarische Porträt Alexanders das Grossen im griechischen und römischen Altertum, Leipzig, 1907 and more recently by J.B. Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1959. Both studies have been done on a broader scale, and no specific attention has been paid to the period of the Early Empire.

CHAPTER I

THE ALEXANDER-IDEOLOGY AND THE EMPERORS

The relationship between Rome and the Greek world developed amidst certain difficulties. On the whole, however, there was a considerable amount of mutual intercourse. During its complex and extended development Rome, generally speaking, partook of the intellectual and cultural tradition of Greece and adopted many of its creations. In this way the symbolism that represented Alexander as the imperial ruler with unlimited power and ability, as the genius whose achievements called to mind divine faculties, gained acceptance among the Romans. This particular view of Alexander exercised a special attraction on those Romans who through their political activities prepared the way for the end of the Republic and the beginning of the Empire. Pompey, Caesar, and Antony made extensive use of this concept of Alexander and its inherent ideology of power and supreme rule.¹

The political development that took place under Augustus and his successors in the Early Empire was not opposed to "diese energetische Auffassung Alexanders".² It provided additional conditions and motives for further use and applications of this Alexander-ideology. The position of supreme power which up to that time had only been the aim or-- at the most--temporarily held by individual ambitious politicians became

¹For the evidence cf. Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, Chapters III and IV.

²This term is used by Heuss, "Alexander der Grosse und die politische Ideologie des Altertums," Antike und Abendland, Band IV, 1954.

now the possession of the Roman emperors. Augustus may have tried to restore the Roman state along traditional lines,¹ but on the level of actual political power he was the supreme ruler of the Roman Rmpire, and around him the cultural life of Rome began to center. In him and from him the monarchial rule of the empire received its beginning and progressively developed on the lines which he had laid down. Since the empire of Alexander was in a sense the predecessor of the Roman Empire, its founder, Alexander the Great, invited attention and comparison from and with the Roman emperors.

One result of the supreme position of the Roman emperors was the development of an imperial--or even divine--cult. Its complexity and manifold aspects are partly due to the different motives behind this cult and the different traditions to which it was linked.² The manner in which the cult evolved and was valued in Italy on the one hand and the East on the other differed considerably. There was also a difference as to the degree this cult was interpreted, accepted, and promoted by the individual emperors.³ Whatever, however, the understanding of their 'own divinity' may have been, the imperial cult was used by most of the emperors of the Early Empire as an expedient device to strengthen their

¹For recent discussions on the development of the principate compare: E.T. Salmon, "The Evolution of Augustus' Principate," Historia, V., (1956), pp. 456-478, and M. Hammond, "The Sincerity of August," HSPH. 69, (1965), pp. 138-169. The last study contains an extensive bibliography.

²For a detailed study on the question of the divinity of the Roman emperors, cf. L.R. Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, Middletown, 1931.

³On the attitude of Tiberius, cf. L. R. Taylor, "Tiberius' Refusals of Divine Honors," TAPHA, LX (1929), 87-101.

autocratic rule. The close association between imperial rule and a subsequent imperial cult had been experienced before in the time of Alexander the Great. The ideas and concepts developed at that time had become part of the Hellenistic tradition and were, as such, known to the Romans.

For the Romans to whom an imperium sine fine¹ had been promised the idea of their empire was always connected with the desire and even obligation of further expansion.² There was always some expectation that the emperor would prove himself as conqueror and above all as conqueror of the Parthians. P.O. Fink in his article "Victoria Parthica and Kindred Victoriae" states: "The position of the Roman emperor as the sole and perpetual victor required as its complement some nation constantly defeated."³ Arguing from conclusions drawn by Gage,⁴ Fink explains that this nation to be constantly defeated was the nation of the Parthians. As the Persians were the object of attack for Alexander, so the Parthians as successors of the Persians were considered the natural object of attack for the Roman emperors who wished to emulate Alexander the Great.

This brief survey might indicate that the political and ideological development in the Early Empire provided points of contact with the

¹Vergil, Aeneid. 1, 279.

²Comp. E. Von Ivanka, "Zur Selbstdeutung des römischen Imperiums," Saeculum, VIII, (1957), 17-31.

³P.O. Fink, "Victoria Parthica and Kindred Victoriae," YCIS, VIII, (1942), p. 100.

⁴Comp. J. Gage, "La theologie de la victoire imperiale," RH, CLXXI, (1933), p. 29.

Alexander-ideology. Its application, however, depended among other factors principally upon the personalities of the individual emperors.

The first part of this chapter will deal with the attitude of Augustus towards Alexander. Augustus' own expression of respect and regard for the Macedonian king will be described. It will furthermore be shown how the parallel Alexander-Augustus was understood and affirmed by the writers of the Augustan era. The response of the successors of Augustus to the Alexander-ideology will be discussed in the second part of this chapter.

Alexander and the Augustan Age

The battle of Actium and the following conquest of Egypt established politically the sole rule of Augustus. His visit to Alexandria following his victory brought about his first response to the Alexander-ideology that is known to us. Suetonius' (Aug. 18) and Cassius Dio's (L1,16,5) reports on this episode have come down to us. It has been assumed that both have made use of a common source.¹ Both accounts speak of Augustus' visit to the tomb of Alexander, where he viewed the body of the great king, and of his subsequent refusal to see the bodies of the Ptolemies. In his refusal--the two writers use a nearly identical phrase--Augustus emphasizes that he came to see a king and not corpses. In making this distinction he seems to indicate that a basic difference--according to him--existed between Alexander and his

¹Cf. Rudolf Hanslik, "Die Augustusvita Suetons," WS, LXVIII, (1954), 127. As to the relation between Suetonius and Cassius Dio, see F. Millar, A Study of Cassius Dio, Oxford, (1964), p. 86.

Ptolemaic successors and imitators.¹ The Hellenistic successors of Alexander had been humiliated by Rome, and their empires had been conquered. Alexander, however, has never suffered defeat.

It is questionable whether the variations in the two accounts indicate a basic difference in the interpretation of the scene on the part of Cassius Dio and Suetonius as suggested by Hanslik.² Dio reports that Augustus actually touched the body "whereupon, it is said, a piece of the nose broke off." According to Suetonius Augustus paid respect to the body of Alexander "by placing upon it a golden crown and strewing it with flowers."³ Hanslik believes that whereas Dio's narration symbolizes the desire of Augustus to become a second Alexander, Suetonius' description expresses only his respect and reverence for the great king. The impression that the memory of Alexander exercised on Augustus is underlined by his behaviour towards Alexandria. Cassius Dio (L1,16,3-4) and Plutarch (Mor. 207 B 4 and Ant. 80,1) tell us that the Roman conqueror spared the city--among other reasons--because it was founded by Alexander. It may be noted that Augustus offers respect and reverence to Alexander, although he must have been aware that Alexander's name and the power of his memory had been used by his opponent Antony to further his own ambitious political plans.⁴

¹See G. Herog-Hauser, RE Supp. IV (1924), s.v. "Kaiserkult," p.821.

²R. Hanslik, "Die Augustvita Suetons," p. 127.

³Augustus' behaviour is reminiscent of a similar gesture by Alexander when he visited the grave of Achilles, see Arrian, Anab. I,12,1: Plutarch, Alex. 15,8: Diodorus, XVII, 17,3.

⁴Evidence is presented by J.B. Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, pp. 58-60.

Another manifestation of Augustus' regard for Alexander and his willingness to perpetuate his symbolism may be seen in his use of a signet bearing the image of Alexander. We know of three different signets used by Augustus: one with the picture of a sphinx, a second being the Alexander-signet and a third one bearing Augustus' own portrait. This information has come down to us through the writings of Pliny and Suetonius. Cassius Dio (LI,3,4ff.) mentions the other two, but omits the Alexander-signet. The context, however, in which his information appears does not attempt to offer a list of all the seals which were used by Augustus. The statement in Suetonius (Aug. 50) is brief but precise:

In diplomatibus libellisque et epistulis signandis initio sphinge usus est, mox imagine Magni Alexandri, novissime sua, Dioscuridis manu scalpta, qua signare insecuti quoque principes perseverarunt.

Pliny (nat. hist. 37,10) presents a more detailed description, especially in regard to the first signet:

Divus Augustus inter initia sphinge signavit. duas in matris anulis eas indiscretas similitudinis invenerat. altera per bella civilia absente ipso signavere amici epistulas et edicta, quae ratio temporum nomine eius reddi postulabat, non ificeto lepore accipientium, aenigmata adferre eam sphingem. quippe etiam Maecenatis rana per collationes pecuniarum in magno terrore erat. Augustus postea ad evitanda convicia sphingis Alexandri Magni imagine signavit.

The signet with the portrait of Augustus is not named in this context. Pliny has mentioned it before (nat. hist. 37.8) when speaking about the fame of Dioscurides and his rank among the artists of his day.

Does the selection and use of the Alexander-signet by Augustus have any special significance? This question has been studied only

recently by H.U. Instinsky¹ against the general background of the history and symbolism of the ancient "Herrschersiegel". After a survey of the use of seals in the Greco-Hellenistic and the Roman world Instinsky emphasizes an important distinction. The Greek city states and the Hellenistic world knew and used the seal as "Staatssiegel". It was essentially related to a public office regardless of the temporary holder of the office. In Rome such a "Staatssiegel" was unknown. Roman magistrates used their own private seals in exercising their function as holders of public offices.² In the selection of their respective signets the Romans were free, and changes were possible. It is, however, highly probable that in using their freedom they were normally guided by tradition or special contemporary considerations.³

Signet-images like that of a sphinx or of Alexander may have by themselves conveyed a certain symbolic meaning. This assumption raises the question whether the images were selected at a particular time or in a specific historical or political situation because of this inherent symbolic content. The question might be answered by relating the symbolism of the image and its special significance to the time during which the signet was used. Unfortunately, nothing is known about the type of Alexander portrait that the signet of Augustus showed. Its specific symbolism, therefore, is impossible to assess. Instinsky feels

¹H.U. Instinsky, Die Siegel des Kaisers Augustus, Baden--Baden, 1961.

²Examples are given by Instinsky, 20-21.

³The Roman coinage presents another significant example of the freedom of Roman magistrates to select their own designs. See E.A. Sydenham, The Coinage of the Roman Republic, London, 1952.

that the Alexander image might possibly have indicated the idea of universal rule.¹ As far as the time and the special circumstances of the use of the seal by Augustus is concerned, he offers a few suggestions the hypothetical nature of which he emphasizes. Interpreting the information on the first signet as given by Pliny (nat. hist. 37,10) and Cassius Dio (LI,3,44,ff.) in the light of the political situation during 31 to 30 B.C., Instinsky believes that the sphinx-signet was replaced by the Alexander signet at about 30 B.C. During this time, Augustus conquered Egypt, stayed in Alexandria and paid attention to the memory of Alexander. According to Instinsky a connection between these events and the selection of the Alexander-signet does not seem impossible. He writes: "Jedenfalls stützen sich die Zeugnisse in einer bemerkenswerten Weise gegenseitig, sie konvergieren auf einen konkreten Augenblick, aus dessen Konstellation sie zugleich verständlich werden."² On the other side, Instinsky concedes that it is even more difficult to find out how long the second seal has been used by Augustus. He is inclined to assume that the constitutional changes of the year 27 B.C. might have caused a change in signets also.

Although Instinsky's study offers no definite conclusions, the author's careful and sound reasoning makes it seem highly probable that the selection of the Alexander-image as signet by Augustus was not an accidental but a deliberate and meaningful act. The meaning would have to consist in Augustus' attempt to relate his own position and newly

¹See Instinsky, Die Siegel des Kaisers Augustus, p. 34.

²Ibid., p. 33.

acquired power to the memory of Alexander and its contemporary significance.

Many scholars have referred to Strabo (XIII, 594) as evidence for Augustus' positive attitude toward Alexander.¹ Strabo speaks of

ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ as being φιλαλέϊστος and of his favourable disposition towards the city of Troy in imitation of Alexander. The context, however, indicates that ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ refers to Julius Caesar, who is named Καῖσαρ ὁ Θεός and *Ἰούλιος*.²

Pliny, however, informs us about another event in which Augustus' name is linked to Alexander's. According to his information (nat. hist. 35,93-94) Augustus displayed and dedicated two paintings by the famous artist Apelles in a prominent place in his own forum. One of the paintings was a figure of 'War' with Alexander in triumph in his chariot. The other picture represented Alexander associated with Victory and with Castor and Pollux. Pliny apparently speaks of Augustus' action to indicate his artistic taste and interest. Whether the content of the two paintings as such served as additional motive for their dedication by Augustus is difficult to say. The same incident has been

¹See especially: E. Norden, "Ein Panegyricus auf Augustus in Vergils Aeneis," RhM. LIV, (1899), p. 468; L. Curtius, "Ikonographische Beiträge zum Porträt der Römischen Republik und der julisch-claudischen Familie," MDAI(R), XLIX, (1934), p. 144; M. Bieber, Alexander the Great in Greek and Roman Art, Chicago, (1964); and "The Portraits of Alexander the Great" in Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc. XCIII, (1949), p. 423; A. Heuss, "Alexander und die politische Ideologie," p. 84.

²E. Norden's great authority might have induced the other scholars to accept his evidence without careful scrutiny. J.B. Nadell uses the passage in Strabo correctly as evidence for Julius Caesar's admiration of Alexander. See J.B. Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, p. 51.

mentioned before by Pliny (nat. hist. 35,27) as an example of Augustus' generous attitude towards the arts, and he does not even mention Alexander.

Pliny's report and especially the name of Apelles calls to mind the comparison offered by Horace (Ep. II.1.232 ff.) between Augustus and Alexander concerning their respective appreciation of the different arts. Alexander is praised by Horace for his selection of Apelles and Lysippus as the only artists worthy of portraying him. He is, however, blamed for not being able to recognize poetic mediocrity. Augustus, the sympathetic patron of Vergil and Varius, is proclaimed to be superior in the choice of poets whom he favours.

Augustus' position in the Roman empire was based on his holding of actual political power and was indicated by various constitutional arrangements that were gradually put into force. His image as imperial ruler, in its many manifestations, was developed on quite a different level from his constitutional position. This last exaltation of Augustus was a response to various aspirations, traditions and opportunities with which he came or was brought into contact, and which he found frequently useful to adopt and even to promote.¹ Comparisons and identifications of the princeps with values and persons--heroes of the past, demi-gods and even gods--known and highly regarded by the Romans were important in

¹About the different forms of imperial representation and their importance and meaning for the development of an imperial status for the Roman emperors Alföldi has offered valuable insight. See A. Alföldi, "Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik," Mus. Helv. VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, (1950-1954). Also Alföldi, "Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells," MDAI(R), XLIX, (1934), 1-118 and Alföldi, "Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser," MDAI(R), XL, (1935), 1-158.

the formation of the imperial image. One of the figures with whom the ruler of the Roman Empire could be compared and identified was Alexander the Great. The enormously prolific Alexander-myth is itself a proof of the tendency to glorify a person by comparing and identifying him with superior powers. Alexander and the concepts that had been formed about him would, therefore, easily provide the basis for analogies and references to the image of Augustus. In regard to the disposition of Alexander and the Alexander nimbus to function as model, H. Christensen comments:

Die Feststellung seiner Monarchie und die Form, in die er seine Herrscherstellung gekleidet hatte, war es, die den römischen Kaisern seit Caesar und Augustus das Vorbild lieferte und sie veranlasste, sich mit ihm in Vergleich zu stellen und seine Gottähnlichkeit ihm nachzumachen.¹

The writers of the Augustan age and after have recorded a number of legends and prophecies which developed around Augustus, and which undoubtedly recall Alexander. Most of these are told by Suetonius (Aug. 94.) and have been studied in detail by Deonna.² A most striking element of similarity is that of Augustus' conception. To his mother as she was asleep in the temple of Apollo, the god appeared in the form of a serpent, as the marks on her body seemed to indicate. When Augustus was born nine months later, he was considered to be the son of Apollo. Nearly the same legend is reported of Olympias, the mother of Alexander, except that the son was considered to be the son of Zeus.³ When the father of Augustus was leading an army through Thrace, he inquired from the priests in the

¹H. Christensen, "Alexander der Grosse bei den römischen Dichtern," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterum*, 12. Jahrg. (1909).

²W. Deonna, "La Légende d'Octave-Auguste," *RHR*, LXXXIII, (1921), 38-57; 163-195.

³Plut. Alex. 11.4.

grove of the god Liber about the destiny of his son. During the sacrifice that followed a pillar of fire sprang forth from the wine that had been poured upon the Altar, and it mounted to the sky. According to the priests this phenomenon had occurred to no one else, since Alexander himself had offered sacrifices on the same altar (Suet. Aug. 94.5). Of these stories Miss Taylor has said that they were "worth recording only because their very existence seems to indicate that there was a public sufficiently convinced of the destiny of Augustus to be interested in them."¹ It might be added that they are not only indicative of interest in the destiny of Augustus but also of the knowledge of the parallel 'Augustus-Alexander' which gave them an additional significance.

The poets of the Augustan age were important instruments in forming the image of Augustus and that of his imperial rule.² They were willing and gifted enough to describe both of these in glowing terms and brilliant forms that at times are reminiscent of Alexander and of what his name stood for. Their poetic ideas and poetic language, however, frequently resist analysis, and the danger of imperfect or even false interpretation is always present. Only a few examples of Augustan poetry will, therefore, be given; those in which the echo of Alexander and the Alexander-myth seems clearly to form a part of the poetic statement.

One of the first scholars who studied an Alexander-parallel in

¹L.K. Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, p. 234.

²In regard to the charge that the Augustan poets were merely mouthpieces of imperial propaganda, see Ch. G. Starr, Civilization and the Caesars, Ithaca, N.Y., (1954), espec. p. 201.

Augustan poetry was Ed. Norden. He has shown, in detail,¹ that the panegyric to Augustus in the sixth book of Vergil's Aeneid (791-807) is modelled after a formal *ἑγκώμιον Βασιλέως* or more specifically after an *ἑγκώμιον Ἀλεξάνδρου*. The specific form of such an ecomion with its many connotations of Alexander has been adopted by Vergil to sing his praise of Augustus. Other critics have followed Norden's lead and tried to find elements of the Alexander panegyric in the poetry of the Augustan era. A. Ballinger² has attempted to reconstruct from Curtius and Arrian the catalogue of heroes and demi-gods which is found in Horace.³ He feels that the origin of this catalogue--with the exception of Romulus, of course,--can be traced back to the first poetic admirers of Alexander, whose works were doubtless known to Horace. Bellinger's study suggests that, whenever Augustus is praised by Horace by being compared with these heroes, the laudes Alexandri Magni are echoed. There is no direct and explicit comparison between Alexander and Augustus to be found in Vergil or Horace.⁴ Associations were advanced through references to prototypes with whom both men had been or were being identified, such as Achilles and Hercules. In different studies evidence has been offered to show that both Alexander and Augustus have been identified with Hercules as well

¹E. Norden, "Ein Panegyricus auf Augustus in Vergils Aeneis," RhM., LIV, (1899), 466-482.

²A. Ballinger, "The Immortality of Alexander and Augustus," YCIS. XV, (1957), 93-100.

³See Horace, c. III, 14,1 ff.; c. III, 3,9 ff.; Ep. II. 1,5 ff.

⁴The only exception might be Horace (Ep. II, 1.232 ff). which has already been discussed.

as Achilles.¹ Achilles was looked upon as the great victor in the east, such a one as Augustus was expected to become², and Alexander had already been. Hercules was seen as the symbol of conquest to the end of the world and as the symbol of immortality. Both--the conquest of the entire world and the status of immortality--had been sought by Alexander and were proclaimed by Augustus.

In fulfilling their function of singing the praise of the emperor, the Augustan poets became also the heralds and prophets of an imperial policy.³ A part of this imperial policy--advocated especially by Vergil and Horace and in the later poems of Propertius--was the call for further expansion of the rule of Rome and for the conquest of her enemies. Above all, the poets expected Augustus to resume the conquest of the East and to bring defeat to the Parthians.⁴ The conquest of the East was felt to be the continuation of Alexander's mission. Commenting on this heritage from Alexander, A.R. Anderson remarks:

This is the reason that in imperial literature we find such terms as Medi, Persi, Indi, Seres used. In our editions of the classical authors the notes tell us that these are general terms for 'eastern' or 'oriental'; they do not, however, tell us that these terms would hardly have been used

¹For the identification with Hercules, see A.R. Anderson, "Heracles and his successors," HSPH, XXXIX, (1928). For the identification with Achilles, see E. Bickel, "Der politische Sinn der Erwähnung des Achilles in der Sibyllenekloge Vergils," RhM. XCVII, (1954), and E. Doblhofer, "Zum Augustusbild des Horaz," RhM. CVII, (1964).

²Cf. esp. Verg. Ecl. IV, 36.

³The relationship between the foreign policy of Augustus and the expression it found in Augustan poetry has been dealt with by H.D. Meyer, Die Aussenpolitik des Augustus und die Augusteische Dichtung, Köln, (1961).

⁴References to the individual poets are to be found in Meyer: op. cit., passim.

then had it not been for Alexander and his cult--the aspiration of the Roman emperors to grow up to his stature.¹

In his interpretation of such an example in the imperial literature, namely Vergil's Aeneid (VII, 604 ff.), Meyer writes: "Die Namen, die genannt werden, der ganze Ton des Entwurfes lassen dem Leser unvermeidlich das Bild Alexanders und seines Ostfeldzuges vor Augen treten."² With similar remarks Meyer comments on passages in Horace (c. III. 3.53 ff.) and Propertius (II,10,13 ff.; IV.3.35 ff.)³.

Support for the association of Augustus with the Alexander ideology that the Augustan poets employ in their works comes from a different field of art. The 'Grand Cameo of Paris', though it was not created during the reign of Augustus,⁴ represents Augustus and Alexander in the upper register. Augustus is shown with sceptre and diadem. Beneath him, in Graeco-Persian costume, floats Alexander, holding the globe in his hands. Globe, sceptre and diadem express 'world-rule' which Alexander had established, Augustus had renewed and enlarged, and which was now the responsibility of Augustus' successors.⁵

The great poets of the Augustan era do not deal with Alexander as

¹Anderson, "Heracles and his successors," p. 55.

²Meyer, op. cit., p. 30.

³Ibid., pp. 44, 71, 78.

⁴L. Curtius, "Ikonographische Beiträge zum Porträt der Römischen Republik und der Julisch-Claudischen Familie" in MDAI(R). XLIX, (1934), dates the origin of the cameo during the rule of Gaius. Balsdon and others are inclined to assume that the cameo was created during the rule of Tiberius, see M.P.V.D. Balsdon, "Gaius and the Grand Cameo of Paris" in JRS XXVI, (1936), 152-160.

⁵As to the identification of Augustus and Alexander and their significance in the cameo there is wide agreement. Cf. the two articles named under ⁴).

an independent topic.¹ His personality and his achievements are recalled in order to describe the greatness of Augustus and to glorify his imperial rule. All theories proposing that echoes of Alexander can be heard in the poetry of Vergil, Horace and Propertius are based on the assumption that the name of Alexander did have a meaning for all to whom this poetry was addressed, especially therefore for Augustus. This assumption leads back to the evidence which was previously discussed in this chapter. Is this evidence strong enough to indicate a significant positive response on the part of Augustus to the name and achievement of Alexander? Viewed in its historical context--as far as this is possible--the evidence indicates a strong interest of the emperor in Alexander and in the ideas that his name conveyed. Pompey, Caesar and Antony expressed their interest in more exuberant words or actions. For them Alexander was the symbol of universal rule that they desired to establish. For Augustus Alexander symbolized universal rule which he had already gained. The significance of Alexander for Augustus is characterized by A. Heuss, who states that in the Macedonian emperor there was--for the Roman emperor--"sowohl eine sachliche als auch psychologische Voraussetzung majestätischer Erhöhung gegeben."²

Alexander and the Successors of Augustus

With the growing extension of its frontiers into the Orient the

¹The only exception might be poem 3 of the 'Catalepton' which has been interpreted as epigram on the death of Alexander, cf. Christensen, op. cit., 120-121. About the authorship of this poem, see H.J. Rose, A Handbook of Latin Literature, New York, (1960), 262-263.

²A. Heuss, "Alexander und die politische Ideologie," p. 85.

Romans had an empire which they could compare with the one of Alexander. Since the time of Augustus they also had an emperor equal in position to the Macedonian king. We have seen how this comparison was perceived and expressed during the reign of Augustus. The conditions and factors that had evoked and substantiated it remained largely unchanged under his successors. It might, therefore, be expected that interest in Alexander and his historical significance did not die out among them.

In the case of Tiberius, the first successor of Augustus, however, no direct evidence is available that would reveal his view of Alexander. The possibility exists that the Cameo of Paris was engraved during his rule.¹ If this were the case, it would mean that the association of Augustus and Alexander in their common function as *κοσμοκράτωρ* was understood and approved at that time.² Tiberius' caution in enlarging the ideological basis for his imperial position may be one of the reasons why no response of his to the Alexander ideology is known. His attempts in this field centered around the person of Augustus,³ whom Tiberius in his laudatio at the funeral proclaimed as having been far superior to Alexander and Romulus.⁴ In his eastern policy Tiberius was

¹See Balsdon, JRS XXVI, (1936), 152-160. The disagreement in dating the Cameo is mainly due--it seems--to the clash between the iconographical interpretation (Curtius) and the historical approach (Balsdon).

²It is not necessary to assume that the Cameo had to be commissioned by Tiberius. If it was, however, created during his time, he certainly would have known about it.

³For evidence see K. Scott, "Tiberius' Refusal of the title 'Augustus'", CP, XXVII, (1932), 43-50, and L.R. Taylor, "Tiberius' Refusal of Divine Honours," TAPhA, LX, (1929), 87-101.

⁴Cassius Dio, LVI.36,3.

conservative, in compliance with the consilium coercendi imperii inter terminos, which he had received from his predecessor.¹

The Alexander-nimbus was recalled, however, during his time in the person of his adopted son and presumed successor Germanicus. We owe this information to Tacitus who in his Annals (11.73) writes on the reaction after Germanicus' death:

Et erant qui formam, aetatem, genus mortis, ob propinquitatem etiam locorum in quibus interiit, magni Alexandri fatis adaequarent. Nam utrumque corpore decoro, genere insigni, haud multum triginta annos egressum suorum insidiis externas inter gentes occidisse.²

Tacitus' comparison proceeds in Germanicus' favour and the implication seems to be that if Germanicus had not died so early he would have become greater than Alexander had been. It has been said that the comparison between Alexander and Germanicus "appears to exist in vacuo,"³ and that nothing is known to reveal a special interest of Germanicus in Alexander. If such an interest existed, it would be understandable why the comparison was made. There are, however, indirect signs which point to a possible association of Germanicus with the magic effects of Alexander's name. During his activities in the East Germanicus visited the city of Troy as Alexander had done. This same city had been especially favoured by Caesar in imitation of Alexander.⁴ Germanicus also

¹Tac, Ann., 1,11.

²The last part of the above passage contains a hint to the effect that neither Germanicus nor Alexander died a natural death. In regard to Alexander, cf. Diod. XVII, 117, 5 ff.; Curt. Ruf. X,10,14 ff.; Arr. Anab. VII, 27,1-2; Just. XII, 13,10 ff.

³Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, p. 76.

⁴See Strabo, XIII, p. 594.

visited Alexandria, the centre of the Alexander-cult. His travels in the East, which--in the words of E. Koestermann--were "eine einzige Demonstration, die bewusst auf Wirkung angelegt war",¹ gained him the respect of some oriental princes and even of the King of the Parthians.² All these happenings would certainly create an atmosphere charged with memories of Alexander, and would make some response on the part of Germanicus very plausible. G.J.D. Aalders has recently called attention to a papyrus fragment which seems to throw some light on Germanicus' attitude during his visit in Alexandria.³ This particular fragment contains part of a speech delivered to the people of Alexandria.⁴ E.G. Turner, the editor of the fragment, argues convincingly for Germanicus as the author of this speech.⁵ Of special interest for our purposes is a passage in the speech which seems to reveal that the idea of an imitatio Alexandri was not averse to Germanicus' thinking. Turner has translated this passage as follows:

Even before now I thought it [Alexandria] to be a dazzling spectacle, in the first place because of the hero who is your founder, to whom a common debt is due from those who have the same aspirations, in the second place because of the good offices rendered by [or, to] my grandfather Augustus and my father. . . .⁶

¹E. Koestermann, "Die Mission des Germanicus im Orient," Historia VII, (1958), p. 340.

²See Tac. Ann. II, 56-57.

³G.J.D. Aalders, "Germanicus und Alexander der Grosse," Historia X, (1961), 382-384.

⁴The fragment has been edited, translated and commented upon by E.G. Turner in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XXV, London, 1959.

⁵Turner, op. cit., p. 103.

⁶Ibid., p. 109.

The text is corrupt in some places and especially the significant term *ὀφείλημα*=(debt') "though it suits the traces, is 'exempli gratia' only".¹ Commenting on this part of the text, Turner remarks that "on this restoration Germanicus leaves a deliberate ambiguity as to whether he is associating only himself, or the whole populace of Alexandria with the aspirations of Alexander."² The text does, however, indicate a definite interest of Germanicus in Alexander and in 'his' city of Alexandria, which may have also been stimulated by the similar behavior of Augustus during his visit to the city.³

This new evidence makes it appear possible that the comparison between Germanicus and Alexander was formed because Germanicus' interest in Alexander was known. This conclusion does not prevent us from assuming that Tacitus might have had special reasons for emphasizing the comparison.⁴

Of Tiberius' successor, Gaius, we have again direct evidence indicating his enthusiasm for Alexander. It consists of Suetonius' statement (Gai. LII.) that Gaius--the occasion is not specified by the writer--wore the breastplate of Alexander, which had been taken from Alexander's tomb. Suetonius is supported by Cassius Dio (LIX,17) who says that the emperor wore the breastplate on the bridge of Baiae. Dio's report connects the incident with Caligula's theatrical performances on the famous 'bridge on boats', which had been constructed at the emperor's

¹Ibid., p. 110.

²Ibid., p. 110.

³Cf. our previous comments on Augustus' visit to Alexandria.

⁴Tacitus wrote during the rule of the emperor Trajan whose enthusiasm for Alexander is well attested. See Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, Chapter VII.

command. The whole episode seems to place Gaius' enthusiasm for Alexander on the level of showmanship. Heuss, therefore, may be justified in his remark that "Alexander war für ihn (Gaius) eine der Masken, die er als Hülle für sein autokratisches Selbstgefühl gebrauchte".¹

The only information that links the name of Claudius with that of Alexander has received different interpretations. In connection with a passage that has already previously been mentioned (nat. hist. 35,94), Pliny tells us that on the two paintings of Alexander dedicated by Augustus, Claudius had the images of Alexander replaced by those of Augustus. Heuss believes² that this action was a conscious revolt on the part of Claudius against the policy of his predecessor. This is, however, unlikely, since Claudius must have known that these paintings had been highly regarded by Augustus and had been dedicated by him. It might be possible that for Claudius the significance of the name and achievement of Alexander had largely been substituted for by the name and memory of Augustus. It is well attested³ that Claudius stressed his connection with Augustus, that he elected him as his model, and that his very name he "adopted as his most sacred and frequent oath."⁴

In an interesting essay on Nero's personality M.P. Charlesworth describes two motives in his character which were predominant and lasting:

¹A. Heuss, "Alexander und die politische Ideologie," p. 86.

²Ibid.

³See A. Momigliano, Claudius, the Emperor and his Achievement, Oxford, 1934, 24-25.

⁴Suet. Claud. XI.2.

The first was Nero's belief in himself as artist, actor, poet, and singer, what we may call 'Nero artifex' and the second, Nero's genuine passion for Greek art in all its manifestations, and also for the Greek people, which we may call 'Nero Philhellen'.¹

Nero's philhellenism and the fact that the Parthian problem again demanded settlement during his principate provided enough ground to recall the memory of Alexander. The way in which Nero's enthusiasm for Alexander was shown is significant of 'Nero artifex'. The artist in him admired the statues of Alexander done by Lysippus and ordered one of them to be gilded.² The actor Nero, who had already posed as Hercules in the theatre,³ would not find it difficult to assume the identity of a second Alexander, whom he wanted to imitate as conqueror and follow to the Caspian Gates. In his preparation for this campaign he calls a new special legion which he had enrolled in the Roman army "the phalanx of Alexander the Great".⁴ On Nero's eastern policy--especially on the two campaigns planned by him⁵--a study by Miss E.M. Sanford has thrown new light.⁶ She has been able to produce evidence for Nero's interest in certain oriental ideas of different origin, in which the arrival of a new 'saeculum' under a new ruler and saviour was predicted. Miss Sanford argues that Nero responded to these ideas and that his plans for the eastern campaigns must be seen in the light of this response. Speaking

¹M.P. Charlesworth, "Nero: Some Aspects," JRS, XL (1950), p. 74.

²Pliny, nat. hist. XXXV, 94.

³Suet. Nero, LIII.

⁴Suet. Nero, XIX, 2.

⁵Suet. Nero, XIX, 2.; Cassius Dio, LXIII.8.

⁶E.M. Sanford, "Nero and the East," HSPH. XLVIII, (1937), 75-103.

of Nero, she says:

He had before him the ideal of a great ruler, sometimes seen as the incarnation or the descendant and successor of Alexander, whose coming was associated with the expected ending of the 'saeculum' after his reign of peace, or with the return of power to Asia as the basis for a universal kingdom which would end the last of the four ages.¹

It is necessary to note that the Alexander who played such a great part in these prophecies and ideas was the legendary Alexander of the Hellenistic-oriental tradition rather than the historical conqueror. Miss Sanford's study is a valuable contribution for an understanding of the ideological atmosphere in which Nero lived, and in which oriental ideas of Alexander had become very prominent.

In the establishment of the Flavian dynasty, the second imperial dynasty of Rome, references to Alexander as the prototype of a universal ruler appear to have played no part. Vespasian's reign marked a turn to simpler ways of living and emphasized a contrast to the fantastic plans of Nero. The first Flavian emperor, who "mediocritatem pristinam neque dissimulavit umquam ac frequenter etiam prae se tulit",² would not have desired to imitate Nero in his unrealistic identification with Alexander. This temptation may well have existed for his son and second successor Domitian, who stressed his association with Dionysos and Hercules.³ The parallel Hercules-Alexander was well known at that time, as can be concluded from the poetry of Statius (Silvae, IV.6.59-74), in which the

¹Ibid., p. 102.

²Suet. Vesp. XII.

³See K. Scott, The Imperial Cult under the Flavians, Berlin 1936, 141 ff.

influence of the spirit of Hercules on the various achievements of Alexander is described.

The evidence describing the attitude of Augustus' successors towards Alexander is not extensive enough to allow any far-reaching conclusions. It is probable that Alexander was largely replaced by Augustus in the function of serving as a model and a basis of comparison for the emerging imperial tradition in Rome. Whenever one of the successors attempted to exalt his position beyond the limits set by the example of Augustus and the regard for Roman traditions, references to Alexander as a model occur. Any criticism of such imperial policies would easily extend to the image of Alexander as well. It is during this time, therefore, that hostile statements on Alexander, which will be dealt with later, appear in our literary sources. Whereas praise of Augustus by Vergil and Horace is couched in terms reminiscent of Alexander, criticism against Nero by Seneca and Lucan is disguised in violent attacks on Alexander.

CHAPTER II

ALEXANDER IN THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE EARLY EMPIRE

The student who turns to the standard histories of Latin Literature will find the names of many authors of the Early Empire, whose literary activities were at least partly devoted to historical writing of one sort or another. They concentrated on contemporary history, but antiquarian research was not entirely neglected; even universal history found an exponent in Pompeius Trogus. Unfortunately, most of these authors are little more than names to us now. Fragments of their long-forgotten works are few. In some cases we know of these writers only, as we do of Trogus, from the abbreviated versions of later compilers.

Investigation into the part that the Alexander-story played in these writings are limited by the same factor that hinders any attempt at a 'complete' reconstruction of the Roman world; the screening process by which only certain sources survived for our use and certain others perished entirely or were reserved in only the most fragmentary form. In any speculation about the possible loss of Roman statements on Alexander some significant features of Roman historical writing should be taken into account.¹ The Romans, reflecting on their past history, were influenced by two motives: pride in the achievements of their ancestors and the conviction that--at all times--Rome had shown herself superior to all

¹For an excellent essay on Roman historical writing with further biographical notes, see W. Hoffmann, "Livius und die römische Geschichtsschreibung" Antike und Abendland, Band IV, Hamburg (1954).

people with whom she had come into contact. Roman historical writing was parochial and centered around the development and achievement of Rome. Events outside Rome or Italy were considered important only insofar as they affected the history of Rome itself. These characteristics of Roman historiography may have influenced the extent to which Alexander was discussed in the historical writings of Rome.

Three historians of the early imperial period have made more than passing remarks on Alexander the Great. Livy's excursus on Alexander is found in Bk. IX, chapters 16 to 19 of his work. The various critical evaluations will be discussed in this chapter. Trogus' narrative of the history of Alexander has been compiled by Justin in books XI and XII of his Epitome Historiarum Philippicarum Pompeii Trogi. No attempt will be made to investigate all aspects of the Alexander-history of Trogus.¹ One question, however, will be studied: Did the fact that Pompeius Trogus was a Latin author, writing in Latin and for Latin readers have any influence on the selection and treatment of his material? Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni will be dealt with in a later chapter.

In addition to the material provided in Livy, Trogus-Justin and Curtius Rufus, information on Alexander is found in the writings of Velleius Paterculus, Valerianus Maximus and Frontinus.

In all three instances where Alexander is mentioned by Velleius

¹For the most recent study on the Alexander-history of Pompeius Trogus, see R. B. Woolsey, Pompeius Trogus' History of Alexander the Great, Dissert., Yale University (1950).

Paterculus in his Historiae Romanae, he is called 'magnus' Alexander.¹ It is significant that in his praise of Julius Caesar Velleius refers to no other historical person but to Alexander to illustrate the greatness of the Roman leader. Caesar is said to have equalled Alexander in "the magnitude of his ambition, in the rapidity of his military operations, and in his endurance of danger".² Alexander, however, was dominated by iracundia and ebrietas, whereas Caesar never yielded to these passions.

The Facta et Dicta Memorabilia of Valerius Maximum contain many examples of Alexander's career and achievements.³ Frontinus describes some of Alexander's military exploits, and he praises him for his mastery of difficult situations.⁴ Most of the material provided in these authors is in the nature of examples and anecdotes. An historical evaluation of Alexander from a Roman view-point is not intended.

Livy's excursus on Alexander follows immediately after his discussion of Papirius Cursor. Livy presents the traditional opinion that this Roman leader against the Samnites would have been a match for Alexander. The subject of the well-known digression is stated in IX, 17, 2: quinam eventus Romanis rebus, si cum Alexandro foret bellatum,

¹Cf. Vell. Paterc. hist. Rom. 1,6,5; 1,11,4; 11,41,1. See also F. Pfister, "Alexander der Grosse. Die Geschichte seines Ruhmes im Lichte seiner Beinamen," Historia, XIII (1964), 37-79.

²Vell, Paterc. hist. Rom. II, 41, 1.

³Cr. Val. Max. I,1 ext. 5; 4 ext. 1; 8 ext.10;III, 3 ext. 1 and 4; 8 ext. 6; IV, 3 ext. 3;7 ext. 2;V,1 ext. 1;6 ext. 5;VI,4 ext. 3;VII,2 ext. 10,11,13;3 ext. 1,4;VIII,11 ext. 2;14 ext. 2,3; IX,3 ext. 1;5 ext. 1;10 ext. 2. For a discussion on the nature and meaning of Valerius, information see, Chapter III.

⁴Frontinus, strateg. I,2,3; 4,9; 7,7; 11,14;II,3,19; 5,17; 11,3.

futurus fuerit.

The Roman historian answers this question by demonstrating, how Rome would have to be considered superior to Alexander in all respects. He does not entirely deny the greatness of Alexander and his abilities as a leader, which he praised before (VIII, 3,7) and will do so again (XL, 9,5 and 6). Livy points out, however, that Rome, too, had many able and outstanding generals at the time of Alexander. In case of a war Alexander would have had to face the Roman Senate, whose members had later been considered to be like kings, not effeminate enemies like Darius and his followers. The Romans would not have had to fear a strong leader, such as Alexander had been, even though he was favoured by fortune. There would have been even less reason to fear the oriental despot, ruled by his passions, that Alexander had become. Livy strengthens his argument by describing the growing deterioration of Alexander's personality, demonstrated by his yielding to his passions. A discussion of the relative military strength of Rome and Macedonia and a comparison of their respective military techniques and experience follows. The argument is concluded by extravagant praise of Rome's invincibility and a suggestion that Augustus' policy of peace will make Rome even stronger:

Mille acies graviores quam Macedonum atque Alexandri
avertit avertetque, modo sit perpetuus huius qua vivimus
pacis amor et civilis cura concordiae.¹

The content of Livy's digression seems to be straight-forward and to present little difficulty in its interpretation. The quality of Roman leadership is praised and favourably compared to Alexander's. Roman

¹Livy, IX, 19, 17.

virtues are extolled, and Alexander's vices are criticized. The Macedonians are said to have had but 'one' leader, who was successful for only ten years. The Romans, however, have had 'many' equally great leaders, and success has been with them for a much longer time.

Critics have been concerned with the purpose of Livy's excursus and have attempted to find the reason for its insertion in this particular part of Livy's work. It is known from the historian's explicit statement to that effect¹ and from his actual practice², how hesitant he was in adding digressions that interrupted the current of his history. W.B. Anderson has argued that Livy's essay is a rhetorical exercise, "a youthful dissertation," composed by the writer in his student days and inserted in his work as a digression.³ There can be no doubt that Livy in this extended personal comment "shows complete mastery of the orator's equipment".⁴ Proof for Livy's youth at the time of composition is seen by Anderson in certain absurd exaggerations and inaccuracies contained in the passage.⁵ In Livy's remark, that too long a life has turned Fortune against many famous men sicut magnum modo Pompeium (IX. 17,6), he finds evidence that "Livy wrote the passage about the year 41 B.C. when the fall of Pompey was a very recent event, still vividly remembered."⁶

¹Livy, IX, 17, 1.

²Cf. A. Klotz, Livius, Amsterdam (1964), 202 ff.

³W. B. Anderson, "The Study of the Ninth Book of Livy," TAPhA, XXXIX (1908), 94-99.

⁴P.G. Walsh, Livy--His Historical Aims and Methods, Cambridge, 1961, p. 40.

⁵Cf. Anderson, TAPhA, XXXIX, (1908), 95-97, where examples are given.

⁶Anderson, ibid., p. 99.

Anderson has made a good case for the rhetorical origin and structure of the argument but has failed to explain why Livy inserted it. He seems, however, to assume that the digression was made for a special purpose, since he is convinced that "Livy doubtless intended to revise it,"¹ that is, to correct its youthful style.

The study of the Italian scholar P. Treves² is more directly concerned with the specific occasion that might have called forth Livy's excursus on Alexander. He argues that the passage as it stands is inconsistent with Livy's chronology and should have been placed in book VIII, where Alexander's name is mentioned for the first time. For him the passage is also inconsistent with the tone of the other references in Livy, where Alexander is called juvenis invictus belli (VIII,3,7), the founder of Alexandria (VIII,24,1), or the architect of the Macedonian empire (XLV,7,3). In book IX, however, Alexander is described as the ambitious conqueror, who would, nevertheless, have met his match in the Roman heroes of the Samnite Wars. Prof. Treves is convinced that these inconsistencies point to a specific occasion which Livy regarded as serious enough to insert his digression. In his attempt to determine this specific occasion he has found, his main clue in the polemic reference to the levissimi ex Graecis who upheld both the maiestas nominis Alexandri and the gloria Parthorum against the nomen Romanorum (IX,18,6). Behind the levissimi ex Graecis Prof. Treves sees the influence of the historian Timagenes, whom Seneca (Ep. XC,13) calls felicitati urbis inimicus and

¹Ibid., p. 99.

²P. Treves, Il Mito Di Alessandro E La Roma D'Augusto, Milan-Naples, 1953, pp. 1-60.

whose hostile tendencies towards Rome and feud with Augustus are well attested.¹ The reference to the Parthians points--in Treves' opinion--to the controversy over policy against Parthia which had become very acute at about 23 B.C.² It was then that Livy was writing book IX. Treves believes, therefore, that the reality of the Parthian question and the anti-Romanism of Timagenes caused Livy to write his excursus and to write it at this time.

One of the starting points of Treves' argument, namely chronological inconsistency on the part of Livy, has been criticized by A.H. McDonald.³ He does not think that the chronologically correct position for a lengthy statement on Alexander would have to be in book VIII, since the references to the Macedonian King in this book themselves "raise notorious problems of chronology".⁴ It also appears that the traditional comparison between Alexander and Papirius Cursor provides as logical a beginning for an extended comparison between Alexander and the Romans in general as the passing references to Alexander in book VIII. Like Prof. Treves, however, one finds it difficult to believe that Livy would have inserted his statement on Alexander as a purely academic question imported from the schools of rhetoric. Livy also intended to do more than to recall an early Roman oral tradition, in which Papirius Cursor was

¹See R. Laquer, RE, XI (1936), s.v. "Timagenes," 1064.

²Information on Augustus' policy against the Parthians at this time can be found in D. Magie, "The Mission of Agrippa to the Orient in 23 B.C." CP, III (1908), 145-152.

³See A.H. McDonald's review of Treves' study in JRS, XLV (1955), 176-178.

⁴Ibid., p. 177.

favourably compared to Alexander.¹

When stating his general dislike of digressions in the beginning of his excursus, Livy emphasizes that this particular issue has occupied his mind many times. His reflection on this question might have started at an early time and in connection with his rhetorical training. He might have even formulated an answer before. His interest might then have been intensified by taking into account the political situation and eastern opposition to Rome in general.² Livy's argument shows many rhetorical elements that might go back to his student days³ but contains also a reference to the peace-policy of Augustus with its contemporary significance (IX,19,17). Livy did not intend to give an absolute evaluation of Alexander but a relative one in comparison with the greatness of Rome.

Pompeius Trogus' Historiae Philippicae written in forty-four books is now known to us only through brief summaries of each book, a few quotations in other writers,⁴ but mostly through an epitome made by

¹Miss Nadell seems to consider Livy's passage mainly "as a further substantiation for the oral tradition" mentioned in Livy, IX.16,9. Cf. Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, p. 15.

²It might not be necessary to assume a specific dated occasion that called forth Livy's digression. Eastern opposition to Rome was not evident in one single event only. The reference levissimi ex Graecis does not have to refer to Timagenes alone and may not even have to refer to historians at all. Cf. G.W. Bowersock, Augustus and the Greek World, Oxford (1965), 109, and also R. Laquer, RE, XI (1936), s.v. Timagenes, 1066.

³Here Anderson may be right in assuming that Livy intended a later revision. Cf. Anderson, TAPhA, XXXIX, p. 99.

⁴For the most recent collection of fragments of Trogus' work, cf. O. Seel, Pompeii Trogi Fragmenta Collecta, Leipzig, 1956.

M. Junius Justinus probably towards the end of the third century A.D. It was published shortly before 2 B.C.¹ The latest event to be mentioned was the surrender of prisoners, military standards and hostages by the king of Parthia in 20 B.C. (Justin, XLII, 5,1). The Historiae Philippicae was the first historical work in Latin to be universal in scope. The preface of Justin's epitome offers some insight into the aims and methods of Trogus. Some of the information given there is probably taken directly from Trogus' own preface.² Two of the more significant statements are as follows:

(1) Cum multi ex Romanis, etiam consularis dignitatis viri, res Romanas Graeco peregrinoque sermone in historiam contulissent, . . . vir priscae eloquentiae, Trogus Pompeius, Graecas et totius orbis historias Latino sermone composuit, ut, cum nostra Graece. Graeca quoque nostra lingua legi possent, . . .

(3) Et quae historici Graecorum prout commodum cuique fuit iter, segregatim occupaverunt, omissis quae sine fructu erant, ea omnia Pompeius divisa temporibus et serie rerum digesta composuit.

A few conclusions may be drawn from this text: Trogus is aware of the fact that he--as a Roman--writes about non-Roman history for Romans. He is using different monographic Greek sources, whose material he intends to combine into a universal history.

Trogus' work opened with a summary of the history of Assyria, which was followed by a fuller account of Persia, to which various chapters on Greek history were linked. Philip of Macedon appeared in book VII. The history of the Macedonian kingdom and of the Hellenistic

¹Cf. A. Klotz, RE, XXI (1952), s.v. "Pompeius Trogus," 2301.

²For an extensive discussion of the relationship between the prefaces of Justin and Pompeius Trogus, cf. O. Seel, Die Praefatio des Pompeius Trogus, Erlangen, 1955.

empires, that developed from it, formed a large part of the work. Books XLI and XLII dealt with the history of Parthia, which alone had resisted Rome so far. In book XLIII a cursory sketch of Roman origins was given. The history of Spain and of Carthage up to the time of their conquest by Rome formed the final part of the history.

Trogus discussed the history of a great number of people which he arranged around the history of the great empires. In attempting to write a universal history on a great--although not new--design,¹ he had set himself an ambitious goal. What was his evaluation of Alexander within this historical perspective which was new to the Romans?

Trogus' Alexander-history formed a central part of his Macedonian history and is dealt with in books XI and XII of his work. The Alexander-portrait developed by the Roman historian has been differently assessed by various scholars. W. Hoffmann finds in Trogus two contrasting portraits of Alexander.² He attributes the friendly predominant view of Alexander to the influence of the panegyric tradition that goes back to Clitarchus. As root for a secondary, unfavourable portrait Hoffmann postulates an early Hellenistic source hostile to Alexander. He feels that Trogus has been unsuccessful in combining the two different approaches into one portrait. For J. Stroux the Alexander of Trogus shows definite traces of the Peripatetic concept of Alexander with its emphasis

¹C. J.W. Swain, "The Theory of the Four Monarchies - Opposition History under the Roman Empire," CP, XXXV, (1940), 1-21.

²W. Hoffmann, Das literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen im griechischen und römischen Altertum, Leipzig, 1907, 60-62.

on a slow negative change in the character of the King.¹ A more recent assessment of Trogus' Alexander-history has been offered by W.W. Tarn.² He finds the Alexander of Trogus "hopelessly bad". As far as Trogus' sources are concerned, he states that "one can find bits of anybody". To him books XI and XII are popular history, although occasionally useful for comparison. They could be neglected "except for the fact that Justin-Trogus gives a more thorough-going account than any other writer of Alexander's alleged intention to conquer the world."³ Tarn also finds "two plainly inconsistent threads in Trogus on Alexander: the glorification of him as supreme conqueror, and the condemnation of him as a cruel tyrant."⁴

As can be seen from this brief survey of previous scholarship, the verdict on Trogus' Alexander-portrait is rather negative. Trogus is not credited with an independent view of Alexander; much less is there, in the opinion of many scholars, any specific Roman evaluation of Alexander evident in his work. On the other hand, it has often been stated that his history shows anti-Roman tendencies, as for example in his praise of

¹J. Stroux, "Die stoische Beurteilung Alexanders des Grossen," Philologus, LXXXVIII (1933), esp. p. 237.

²W.W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, Vol. II, Cambridge (1950), 122-126.

³Ibid., p. 126.

⁴Ibid. With reference to the relation between Justin and Trogus, no great effort has been made to distinguish between the two. Most scholars speak indiscriminately of Justin, Trogus, or Justin-Trogus.

the Parthians¹ and in his attempt to magnify Alexander against Rome.²

Not all critics, however, have been satisfied with the predominantly negative judgment on this first Roman attempt at universal history. It has been claimed that scholars have not paid attention to Trogus himself but have mainly studied the question of his sources. The German scholar O. Seel has published a monograph that is partly devoted to an analysis of fragments in order to recover parts of the preface that Trogus can be assumed to have written.³ From the postulated and reconstructed preface Seel attempts to throw light on the whole work of Trogus and--among other aspects--on its presumed anti-Roman tendencies. A few of the important points that Seel makes will be discussed briefly.⁴

It is Professor Seel's complaint that many scholars attribute to Trogus only the role of a translator and not that of a genuine historian, although Trogus had defined his role as such (Just. Pref). They have found it easier to accuse Trogus of translating anti-Roman statements than to blame him for composing them. They have then tried to identify Timagenes as the source from which Trogus translated. Seel is critical of the Timagenes-hypothesis, which--he feels--has no real foundation. He is convinced that the so-called anti-Roman statements can be explained

¹Cf. A. Klotz, RE XXI (1952), s.v. "Pompeius Trogus," 2308, and J.W. Swain, CP, XXXV (1940), 17-18.

²W.W. Tarn, op. cit., p. 126.

³O. Seel, Die Praefatio des Pompeius Trogus, Erlangen, 1955.

⁴Their validity can only be judged after a thorough investigation of the historiographical theories whose knowledge is largely assumed by Prof. Seel. Cf. also H. Volkmann, "Antike Romkritik, Topik und historische Wirklichkeit," Gymnasium, Beiheft 4, Heidelberg (1964).

differently, "sofern man den Geist des Trogus nur erst einmal begreift in seiner pessimistisch-pragmatischen und zugleich romgläubigen, seiner realistischen und zugleich irrational-religiösen Struktur."¹ For him these passages must be understood within the framework of Trogus' whole approach to his history, which is described by Seel as follows:

Die ganze Art der Zueinanderordnung und Durchleuchtung ist römisch im angedeuteten Sinne, nämlich--um es negative zu sagen--: nicht livianisch, nicht ciceronisch, sondern jenes irrationalen pragmatischen Geistes, der im Kerne caesarischer Geist ist: der an der Tyche gebunden ist, dem nichts an dem beflissenen Nachweis von formaler Gerechtigkeit liegt, wo es um das Bekenntnis zu Rom geht, der also auch zu scharfer und gleichwohl römischer Romkritik souverän genug bleibt--nicht anders als etwa Sallust, gelegentlich auch Horaz, nicht zuletzt Tacitus.²

After he has established Trogus' claim to be viewed as a Roman historian, Prof. Seel discusses different topics, such as the title of Trogus' work, the influence of Theopompus, the concept of 'universal history' in the Hellenistic and Roman tradition, the place of Rome within a universal history, in their significance and relevancy for Trogus' work. Many of the statements made by the author in this connection are highly speculative and hypothetical in nature. He concludes, however, with a high degree of certainty that Trogus was in his universal history guided by the intention of showing that all past history converges upon Rome "als auf ihr rational nicht weiter begründbares, providentielles Telos."³

Prof. Seel's study provides the basis for a new approach to the work of Trogus as a whole. His conclusions are not applied to any particular part of the Historiae Philippicae as such. The Alexander-history

¹ O. Seel, Die Praef. des Pomp. Trogus, 19-20.

² Ibid., p. 20.

³ Ibid., p. 62.

is referred to once, when Seel suggests that Trogus might have looked upon the empire of Alexander as "ein deutendes Gleichnis", which pointed to its true fulfillment in the empire of Augustus.¹

The Alexander-history of Pompeius Trogus itself, however, has been made the subject of a dissertation by R.B. Woolsey.² The author seems to have anticipated the advice of Prof. Seel to direct his attention to Trogus himself and not exclusively to a study of his sources. Woolsey sees in Trogus an historian who was stimulated by the figure of Alexander the Great to investigate the history of the world before his time. He finds evidence for this assumption in the amount of space that Trogus devoted to Macedonian history, of which Alexander, his life and achievements as conqueror, is found to form the center. Trogus' portrayal of Alexander is characterized by Woolsey as an honest attempt to include all qualities--both superior and inferior. Here, Trogus had to depend on his sources and rarely added evaluating comments of his own. Woolsey finds that Trogus was especially impressed by Alexander as the conqueror and founder of a great empire, and that his final assessment of the Macedonian king was largely determined by this impression. This specific viewpoint to Trogus is seen by Woolsey as a reflection of Julius Caesar's attitude towards Alexander and of his aspiration to build a similar great empire.³ It is his contention that the influence of Caesar's thought

¹Ibid., p. 29.

²R.B. Woolsey, Pompeius Trogus' History of Alexander the Great, Dissert. Yale University (1950).

³Cf. The extensive comments in Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, Chapter IV.

on Trogus goes back to the relationship between the Roman leader and Trogus' father.¹ In his summary Woolsey emphasizes the great value of Trogus in reconstructing the influence which Alexander had on a historical figure of a period later than his own by nearly three hundred years.

Not all critics will agree with Prof. Seel and attribute to Trogus almost the whole of Justin's preface as well as passages from John of Epiphania and Cassiodorus. I believe, however, that Seel has made a convincing case for a few statements from Justin's preface, especially those that have been quoted in this study.² The general picture of Trogus that Seel--based on his analysis of the preface--gradually builds up is of great interest and presents an alternative to the previous approach to the Roman writer, which consisted nearly exclusively in a search for his sources. Woolsey's dissertation shows that there is a Roman viewpoint evident in Trogus' interest in and approach to the Alexander-story. It might not be necessary to assume that Caesar's influence is exclusively responsible for Trogus' viewpoint. To look upon the empire of Alexander and its founder as a prototype of the Roman empire and its leader was an idea also very much acceptable to Augustus and his age.

In his Anabasis the historian Arrian writes that at the time of Alexander's great achievements there was "no race of mankind, no city, no individual, whither the name of Alexander had not reached."¹ Three

¹See Trogus' own information on his family, Justin, XLIII, 5,12.

²Cf. T. Janson, Latin Prose Prefaces, Stockholm, Acta Universitatis Stockholmensis, XIII (1964), 77-83. Janson's criticism seems to be mainly directed against Seel's use of John of Epiphania and Cassiodorus in his reconstruction of Trogus' preface.

³Arrian, Anab. VII, 30.

hundred years later Alexander's name was still well-known in Rome and his achievements meaningful to the Romans. Roman historical writers, however, who wrote on Alexander during the early imperial period, seem to have been few in numbers and silent on much that a modern student would desire to know. Most of them did not offer an extensive interpretation of one of the most remarkable careers in history. Still the figure of the great Macedonian king loomed in their minds, and his achievements presented the favoured historical background against which the success of Rome and her leaders could be measured. It was felt that a parallelism existed between Alexander's world power and the Roman empire, and some writers were tempted to make comparisons.

When Velleius in his hasty survey of Roman history stops¹ to praise the greatness of Julius Caesar, he turns to Alexander as the only historical figure that provides a basis for comparison. Livy's comparison between Alexander and Rome is polemic in nature and not an historical assessment. The Roman historian, of course, argues passionately for the superiority of Rome, since for him "nulla unquam res publica nec maior nec sanctior nec bonis exemplis ditior fuit."² In this argument, however, Alexander's greatness is underlined by Livy's admission that this particular comparison has interested him for a long time. There is further the possibility that Livy was only one of the participants in a debate on the relative greatness of Rome and Alexander the Great. Such a debate in itself would be a testimony of Alexander's impact on the

¹Cf. Vell. Pat. hist. Rom. II, 41,1. . . . quamlibet festinantem in se morari cogit.

²Livy, Pref. II.

Romans.

Pompeius Trogus' view of Alexander was not influenced by such polemics. Within the scope of his universal history he has given a prominent place to the history of Alexander. For Trogus the empire of Alexander was the most worthy predecessor of the glory of Rome.

Although one would wish for more material on Alexander in the writings of Roman historians during the early imperial period, they have attested to his greatness. They have done so not so much through pronounced positive evaluations as by giving him the role of an outstanding predecessor, military example, and historical rival for the glory and power of Rome.

CHAPTER III

ALEXANDER IN THE RHETORICAL TRADITION OF THE EARLY EMPIRE

A study, the purpose of which is to discover and assess Roman views of Alexander in the Early Empire must pay attention to the rhetorical schools of this period. They were a very important element in Roman education and exercised a determining influence upon the literature of imperial Rome.¹ In the course of their rhetorical training young Romans came into contact with the literature of Rome and Greece, with historical knowledge and philosophical ideas, and most probably with the figure and achievements of the great Macedonian king. The treatment of the Alexander-theme in the Roman schools, however, must be studied and valued in the light of the specific nature of the rhetorical education.

With the end of the Republic a new chapter had opened in the history of Roman rhetoric. The change that occurred is well described by M.L. Clarke:

If one turns from Cicero's account of his early training in the Brutus to the Controversiae and Suasoriae of the elder Seneca, one is conscious of having moved into a different world. The forum and the senate house are forgotten and the centre of interest is now the school. And the school has thrown open its doors and become something like a theatre. The stage is held by the rhetorician, no longer a pedantic theorist and now rather a star performer. His performances are known as declamations.²

¹For a description of the influence of the rhetorical schools, see H. Peter, Die Geschichtliche Literature über die Römische Kaiserzeit, Leipzig (1897), Vol. I, Chapter I., and J.W. Duff, A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age, London (1927), Chapter II.

²M.L. Clarke, Rhetoric at Rome, London (1953), p. 85.

The instruction of students was still directed towards making them good public speakers. This aim, however, was now effected, to an increasing extent, by new forms of spoken exercises. In the imperial epoch these declamations were called controversiae and suasoriae, respectively. The controversiae were debates on fictitious themes, usually modelled on law-court cases. The suasoriae were exercises in persuasion or dissuasion presented as advice to some historical and mythological character, or group of characters, on what should be done in a critical situation. Although new themes could always be devised for the student, there gradually developed a number of topics which seem to have been regularly repeated. Among them Alexander's career came to be a popular subject in the schools. Of the seven suasoriae on which Seneca has left notes two relate to Alexander. Their themes are as follows:

(I) Deliberat Alexander an Oceanum naviget.

(IV) Deliberat Alexander Magnus an Babylona intret, cum denuntiatus esset illi responso auguris periculum.

The first suasoria is also mentioned in Seneca's Controversiae (VII.7.19).

Evidence for the popularity of Alexander-topics in the rhetorical schools is also offered in other authors. One reference occurs already at the close of the Republic, in the Ad Herrenium (IV,22.31), where the name of Alexander is used to illustrate a rhetorical device. We are reminded again of Seneca's first suasoria by Quintilian's example of a constitutio coniecturalis: An Alexander terras ultra Oceanum sit inventurus (Inst. orat. III.8.16). Alexander's behavior in Thebes is the basis for a controversia in Quintilian (Inst. orat. V.10.III), who also refers briefly to a declamation which dealt with Alexander's burial in

Babylon. (VIII.5.24) Valerius Maximus in his Facta et Dicta Memorabilia made obvious use of material from the schools¹ which he intended to preserve for later rhetoricians and orators, who liked to point their arguments with illustrative parallels. Among his rhetorical exempla incidents from Alexander's life occupy a prominent place. They are grouped under the exempla of patientia (III. 3 est. 1 and 4), constantia (III. 8 ext. 6), amicitia (IV. 7 ext. 2), clementia (V. 1 ext. 1), iracundia (IX. 3 ext. 1), superbia (IX. 5 ext. 1), and cupiditas gloriae (VIII. 14 ext. 2 and 3).

Although one could wish for more material, the sources, nevertheless, suggest that the name of Alexander was a meaningful one for the Roman students, and that the memory of his achievements could still arouse their interest and imagination. There is, however, no indication that a consistently hostile attitude towards Alexander prevailed in the rhetorical schools of Rome. Our sources show that a specifically Roman portrait of Alexander was apparently not developed there at all. The strong influence of the Greek rhetorical tradition may have been partially responsible for this last fact.² The rhetorical exercises were debates, and negative as well as positive aspects of a main character were brought out. No final assessment and consistent characterization were intended. One must also remember that the subjects of the declamations were not of

¹On the sources of Valerius Maximus, cf. R. Helm, "Valerius Maximus, Seneca und die 'Exemplasammlung'", Hermes, LXXIV (1939), 130-154.

²For a reference to the Greek influence on the Alexander-topics, see H. Peter, Die Geschichtliche Literatur über die Römische Kaiserzeit, Vol. I, 25-26, and S.F. Bonner, Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire, Los Angeles (1949), 33-34.

primary importance. It was the manner of treating them that counted, and this, as can be seen from Seneca's examples, gave opportunity for displays of wit, ingenuity of expression and analytic power. For example, the attraction of the first suasoria does not seem to have been based on the fact that it dealt with Alexander, but rather on the possibilities for grand and horrifying descriptions of the oceanus that it provided. The eloquent speech of Fabianus in this exercise¹ could have served equally well as a general discourse on the perils of the sea, so loosely is it attached to the person of Alexander himself. Although Alexander was obviously favoured as a topic, the success of the declamation did not particularly depend on any definite attitude towards him, but rather on the ingenuity of the dilemma posed in the exercise and on the possibility for the speaker to add color to the discussion.²

From the Augustan age on, as might be expected from the growing popularity of the practice of declamation, the influence of the suasoriae and controversiae on Latin literature becomes ever more marked.³ Many Latin authors can be shown to reflect 'rhetorical' influence in the form and style of their writings, although the influence did not derive only from the declamatory exercises. It may, therefore, be no surprise to find that echoes of the Alexander-themes of the rhetorical schools have been discovered in some writers of the imperial period. One example,

¹Cf. Seneca rhet., Suas. I.4.

²A good definition and explanation of 'color' as rhetorical term is given by Bonner, Roman Declamation, 55-56.

³An excellent general account is given by E. Norden, Antike Kunstprosa, Reprint, Stuttgart (1958), Vol. I. 300 ff.

Livy's excursus on Alexander (IX, 16-19), has already been dealt with in Chapter II. E. Norden, whose opinion that Vergil's praise of Augustus in his Aeneid (VI. 791-805) is based on an Alexander-encomion has also already been discussed, finds in the same passage suggestions of Seneca's first suasoria.¹ Whereas Alexander has been deliberating whether he should sail the ocean, Augustus' heir--according to Vergil's prophecy--will actually do so and will extend his empire extra sidera tellus, extra anni solisque vias (795-796). Horace's third ode of book III has been seen by H.J. Mette as another example of rhetorical influence.² Mette believes that a rhetorical exercise, whose subject he tentatively states as "Alexander an den Säulen des Herakles (vor der Fahrt auf das grosse Weltmeer)", is "ein wesentliches subaudiendum" of Horace's poem. He interprets the poem as an advice to Augustus to exercise moderation and not to imitate Alexander's reckless desire to enter the unknown against the will of the gods.

The rhetorical influence that critics have noticed in these two examples from Roman literature seems to recall again the view of Alexander as a man dominated by a strong longing to conquer unknown worlds. This same view is suggested in the first suasoria and is interpreted in one of Valerius Maximus' examples (VIII. 14 ext. 2) as an indication of Alexander's pectus insatiabile laudis.

There has been a marked tendency among critics to speak of a

¹Cf. E. Norden, "Ein Panegyricus auf Augustus in Vergil's Aneis," RhM. LIV (1899), p. 469.

²H.J. Mette, "Roma (Augustus) und Alexander," Hermes LXXXVIII (1960), pp. 458-462.

hostile attitude towards Alexander in the rhetorical schools.¹ Hoffmann in his discussion of the influence of Roman rhetoric on the Alexander - portrait declares categorically: "Die Rhetoric war eine ausgesprochene Gegnerin Alexanders, weil sie in der neuen Monarchie der Hort des Republikanismus wurde".² As proof for the last part of his statement Hoffmann refers to the impossibility for the Roman republican opposition to speak out openly. The schools, therefore, became a place of refuge, where the old topics of tyranny and tyrannicide were discussed and this time with a contemporary meaning. In these debates, Hoffmann states, "wandte sich naturgemäss der Tyrannenhass der Magister auch gegen Alexander".³ Hoffmann's argument seems to overemphasize the role played by the rhetorical schools in the republican opposition as may be seen from the following remark by M.L. Clarke:

Tyranny and tyrannicide were subjects not without contemporary reference, and it is natural to suppose that the freedom with which they were discussed in the schools was not unconnected with the discretion necessary outside. But after reading Seneca's reports of the declamations on these subjects one is inclined to acquit the declaimers of seditious thoughts, so unreal and remote is the atmosphere.⁴

Evidence for hostility towards Alexander in the rhetorical schools is found by Hoffman in Livy's excursus, which he wrongly interprets as an

¹Cf. W. Hoffmann, Das literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen, pp. 45-50; J. Stroux, "Die stoische Beurteilung Alexanders des Grossen," Philologus, LXXXVIII (1933), E. Schwartz, Griechische Geschichtschreiber, Leipzig (1959), p. 184.

²Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 45.

³Ibid., p. 48.

⁴M.L. Clarke, Rhetoric at Rome, pp. 91-92. Cf. Also Bonner, Roman Declamation, p. 34, who states that "themes involving tyrants and tyrannicides and pirates are more likely to have been invented in Greek than in Roman schools, on the ground that tyrants were more characteristic of Hellenistic Greece than Augustan Rome."

outburst of hate against Alexander,¹ and in the writings of Seneca the Younger and Lucan. In the Alexander-criticism of these two writers, however, philosophical viewpoints and perhaps even political motives were combined with the language of the rhetoricians.² Seneca's and Lucan's statements on Alexander will, therefore, be discussed in a different context.

In summary, one can see that history, as one of the branches of the orator's learning on which Cicero had laid such stress,³ had its place in the declamations of the rhetorical schools. The declaimers, we have seen, frequently used historical themes, particularly in the suasoriae, and took pride in decorating their speeches with historical examples and allusions. On many occasions, however, the material from history was used in a ready-made set of arguments and modes of treatment and with no regard for any specific relevance. This same practice was followed in the treatment of the Alexander-theme. The popularity of this theme is well attested and is in itself indicative of the interest in Alexander's name and career within the schools. Our limited evidence, however, does not reveal any specific view of Alexander among the rhetoricians. Judging from Seneca's first suasoria and its reflection in Roman literature, we find that one characteristic of Alexander's personality has received some emphasis: his desire to search for unknown

¹See Chapter II of this study.

²Even Hoffmann points out the influence of philosophical ideas on the Alexander portrait in Seneca and Lucan, cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 49.

³Almost any speech of Cicero will provide examples of his use of history. His preference for historical examples is stated in Verr. II, 3;209. Cf. also Cicero, De Orat. II, 15,62.

worlds. This characteristic can be interpreted in two ways. It can be seen as a sign of Alexander's daring and boundless energy but also as an indication of his lack of moderation and even of his megalomania. Both interpretations are offered in the first suasoria, although the stress is one the second one.

The influence of rhetoric during the early Roman Empire was felt in most branches of writing and in most writers of this time. Since Roman rhetoric taught inventio as well as elocutio, it influenced habits of thought as well as of expression. One must be careful, however, in drawing conclusions from the rhetorical form of a statement to the origin of its contents from within the rhetorical schools. A distinction between rhetorical form and content must also be drawn in evaluating the Alexander-criticism of the early imperial period. It is necessary, therefore, to assess the motives and meaning behind this criticism.

CHAPTER IV

ALEXANDER IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITION

Justice and happiness in this world will not be assured, Plato had argued, until the day when political power and philosophy coincided in one and the same man.¹ About five hundred years later Plutarch hailed Alexander as the man who holding great political power exercised it with such wisdom that he deserved to be called a great philosopher.²

The question of the effect that political power exerts on a great leader will be an appropriate subject of philosophical study at all times. The same question might have sparked the interest of the Hellenistic philosophers in the person and career of Alexander the Great. Following the predominant philosophical trends of their time, they would likely express their view of Alexander in terms of their ethical theories and not necessarily be interested in historical or psychological accuracy.³

From the fragmentary evidence that we possess, it seems that some of the Hellenistic philosophers did not share Plutarch's enthusiastic opinion about Alexander. On the contrary, modern critics have been concerned with the hostility shown to Alexander in the schools of Hellenistic philosophy and have interpreted Plutarch's exuberant praise as a

¹Plato, Repl. 473D & E; 474C and passim.

²Plutarch, De Alex. Magni fortuna aut virtute, I-XI. 326E-333C.

³Cf. J. Stroux, "Die stoische Beurteilung Alexanders des Grossen," Philologus, LXXXVIII (1933), 223 and 240.

passionate reaction to this hostility.¹ They have distinguished two hostile portraits of Alexander; one originating from the Peripatetic School and another one within the Cynic-Stoic tradition.² It has been argued that these two portraits dominated the discussion of Alexander's character during the many centuries of antiquity. The Alexander-criticism in the Early Roman Empire has usually been explained with reference to these two hostile accounts.

A detailed examination of the philosophical roots for this presumed hostility against Alexander is beyond the scope of this study. An understanding of the main features that have been attributed to these two philosophical portraits, however, is necessary for an assessment of the criticism aimed at Alexander during the first century A.D. Such an understanding will then allow us to search for other factors that might have influenced Seneca, Lucan and Curtius in their critical and hostile remarks on Alexander.

Alexander's relationship to the Peripatetic School was based on personal contact. Aristotle, the founder of the school, had been his teacher. Callisthenes, a relative of Aristotle and a member of the school, had accompanied Alexander on his campaigns and written on his exploits.³ In the year 327 B.C., however, Callisthenes had been killed

¹As for example by Tarn, "Alexander, Cynics and Stoics," AJPh., LX (1939), p. 56.

²For a discussion of these two portraits, see: W. Hoffmann, Das literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen, 1-18; J. Stroux, Philologus, LXXXVIII (1933), 220-240; and W.W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, Vol. II, *passim*.

³Cf. T.S. Brown, "Callisthenes and Alexander," AJPh. LXX (1949), 225-248 and L. Pearson, The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great, Oxford, 1960, chapter II.

and Alexander was held responsible for his death.¹ These facts must be kept in mind when the attitude of the leading Peripatetics towards Alexander is being studied. Our evidence on this question is, unfortunately, very limited. The question of Aristotle's influence on Alexander has frequently been examined, and a later alienation between student and teacher has been suspected.² However, no convincing evidence for this assumption has been found. Aristotle's reaction to the death of Callisthenes is unknown to us.³ Statements on Alexander by two of the first members of the Peripatetic School, Aristoxenus and Dicaearchus,⁴ are quoted by Plutarch in his Vita Alexandri (4,2) and by Athenaeus (603 a and b), respectively. Both texts have recently been examined again by E. Mensching.⁵ After a careful and very detailed analysis Mensching concludes: "Mit der Zurückhaltung die das geringe Material auflegt, ergibt sich, dass Aristoxenos positive, Dikaiarch höchstens indifferent über Alexander schrieb."⁶

Regarding the attitude of Theophrastus, the successor of Aristotle as head of the school, there is somewhat more evidence. After the death

¹Cf. Arrian, Anab. IV (10-14); Plutarch, Alex. 52-55.

²Cf. Ph. Merlan, "Isocrates, Aristotle and Alexander the Great," Historia, III (1954-55), 60-80, and O. Gigon, "Interpretationen zu den antiken Aristoteles - Viten", MH.XV (1958), 145-193.

³Cf. V. Ehrenberg, Alexander and the Greeks, Oxford, 1938, 84f.

⁴For information on the early Peripatetics, see F. Coplestone, A History of Philosophy, Vol. I., Westminster, MD. (1960), 369-371.

⁵E. Mensching, "Peripatetiker über Alexander," Historia, XII (1963), 274-282.

⁶Ibid., p. 280.

of Callisthenes he wrote a work *Καλλισθέως ἡ περὶ πέρθους*¹. The work has not survived, but two references to it have been found in the writings of Cicero. In Tusc. III.21 Cicero tells us that Theophrastus in lamenting the death of his friend Callisthenes was grieved at the prosperity of Alexander and said that "Callisthenes incidisse in hominem summa potentia summaque fortuna, sed ignarum quemadmodum rebus secundis uti conveniret." In another passage, Tusc. V.25, Cicero says of Theophrastus:

Vexatur idem Theophrastus et libris et scholis omnium philosophorum, quod in Callisthene suo laudavit illam sententiam: vitam regit fortuna, non sapientia. Negant ab ullo philosopho quidquam dictum esse languidius.

The two statements by Theophrastus as quoted by Cicero have been taken as an indication of a theory which was developed in the Peripatetic School. It would allow a criticism of Alexander without questioning the success of Aristotle's educational efforts. This theory supposedly stated that the influence of fortuna and potentia effected a change in Alexander's character. The following statement of Cicero in a letter to Atticus (Ad Att. XIII, 28,3) has been considered a reference to this theory:

Tu non vides ipsum illum Aristoteli discipulum summo ingenio, summa modestia, postea quam rex appellatus sit, superbum, crudelem, immoderatum fuisse?

The information on Theophrastus leaves many questions unanswered. Are the two statements of Theophrastus combined with Cicero's remark to Atticus sufficient evidence for the acceptance of the "Umschlagtheorie"?²

¹The title is given by Diog. Laert, V, 44.

²This term is used by E. Mensching, Historia, XII (1963), p. 280.

If such a theory existed, was it the official 'opinion' of the Peripatetic School or only the private view of Theophrastus? Did the theory originate with Theophrastus? Who was the author--historian or philosopher--whose writing transmitted this Peripatetic view of Alexander into the Roman world?¹

Among the modern Alexander-historians W.W. Tarn has been a firm advocate of a Peripatetic portrait of Alexander.² Tarn is convinced that the main portrait of Alexander as presented in Curtius Rufus is the Peripatetic one: "Aristotle turned out a perfectly good and virtuous pupil, but he was ruined by his own fortune and became a cruel tyrant."³ In explaining the origin and the development of the Peripatetic tradition, Tarn relies mainly on the evidence from Theophrastus. He also refers to the possible influence of Cassander on some Peripatetics as a factor in the growth of their hostility towards Alexander.⁴ Tarn also argues that the Peripatetic philosophers attempted to blacken the name of the king by hinting at his seemingly abnormal attitude towards sex. Dicaearchus is cited as his main witness and blamed to have invented the 'Bagoas-story' in order to discredit Alexander.⁵ The British historian is, however, unable to offer any evidence which would illustrate the continuation of a Peripatetic tradition to the time of Curtius Rufus.

¹Mensching believes that Theophrastus' work did not survive very long, and that Cicero did know it only from a secondary source. See *Historia*, XIII (1963), 282n.

²W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, Vol. II, passim. ³*Ibid.*, 97.

⁴*Ibid.*, 268; 320; 432-433. No evidence is offered.

⁵The story deals with Alexander's favoritism towards the eunuch Bagoas. Cf. Tarn, Vol. II, appendix 18.

The following statement characterizes Tarn's response to this problem:

But there is no evidence to show that any writer before Curtius ever committed to writing the full Peripatetic portrait of Alexander; indeed no writer is ever known who could have done so; the portrait depended on what might be called University teaching, a tradition of the Peripatetic school, often no doubt alluded to in writing, possibly even to some extent expounded (though this is not actually known), but never embodied in a full-length history.¹

Tarn's insistence on a Peripatetic Alexander tradition has been criticized by E. Badian.² In his article Badian deals mainly with Tarn's rejection of the Bagoas-episode, but his "study in method" turns into a full attack on the theory of an alleged Peripatetic portrait of Alexander. Some of his critical observations are as follows: He believes that the character of Theophrastus' work Callisthenes or on Grief has been misunderstood, and the conclusions drawn from the quotations in Cicero have been too far-reaching. Referring to the example of Cicero's Laelius and Cato Badian sees in Theophrastus' work "a disquisition on a philosophical subject dedicated to the memory of a great man."³ Unless inescapable evidence is offered, he finds no reason to assume that Theophrastus developed his writing into a philosophical theory on Alexander or on fortune. For Badian the Alexander, referred to by Cicero in his letter, does not reflect the influence of Theophrastus or the Peripatetic School but "is the Alexander of a Roman aristocrat chafing under the regnum of Caesar."⁴ Badian's final rejection of Tarn's view may be quoted here:

¹Tarn, Vol. II, 100-101.

²E. Badian, "The Eunuch Bagoas," CQ., LII (1958), 144-157.

³Ibid., p. 154.

⁴Ibid., p. 156.

That Theophrastus disapproved of the king who had killed his friend we may well believe; . . . But that this disapproval was ever worked up into a philosophical portrait, much less into a 'doctrine of Chance', which was applied to Alexander, and that such a view became canonical in the Peripatetic School ever after--that, as far as our information goes, is pure invention, unsupported by any evidence whatsoever.¹

Badian and Tarn are, of course, holding extreme positions on this question. Tarn is convinced that the evidence is sufficient to assume the existence of an 'official' Peripatetic account of Alexander with a well-developed portrait of his character. Badian wants the idea of such a Peripatetic tradition to be discarded entirely, since, for him, it is based on speculation only and has been of no help in solving the existing problems which the sources for the history of Alexander still provide.

Badian's criticism--if directed against Tarn's view of an official Peripatetic account of Alexander and a well-defined hostile portrait of him within the Peripatetic School--can be supported. The evidence is not sufficient to warrant Tarn's claims. On the other hand, the evidence is strong enough to suggest that Alexander and his career were discussed among the followers of Aristotle. The discussion might have taken place along various lines and with changing emphasis. It may have dealt with the role of τύχη in history generally and in the career of Alexander in particular. Cicero in Tusc. V.25 informs us that Theophrastus' view of the great influence of τύχη met with strong opposition among other philosophers. Another reference from Cicero (Tusc. III,21) suggests that Alexander's career furnished some material for Theophrastus' reflection on the power of τύχη. Demetrius of Phalerum seems to have placed still greater influence on the role of τύχη. Fragments from his work

¹Ibid., p. 156.

περὶ τύχης¹ show that Demetrius regarded the whole of human history as subject to the arbitrary rule of τύχη. Unfortunately, the fragments do not tell us how Demetrius presented the influence of τύχη in the career of Alexander. It seems probable that the discussion on the role of τύχη was continued among Peripatetic philosophers. New historical experiences and debates with other philosophical schools may have sparked the interest in this topic.² Plutarch's treatment of the theme Ἀλεξάνδρου τύχη ἢ ἀρετή might be an example of the continued discussion and reflect previous arguments.³

Concluding this brief survey we might say that Peripatetic ideas could well have influenced the assessment of Alexander, and that this influence could have been transmitted within traditional accounts of Alexander. Our evidence, however, is not strong and detailed enough to indicate a consistent hostile portrait of Alexander within a definite Peripatetic tradition. The theory of a Peripatetic account should not prevent us from searching for other factors which may have influenced a writer such as Curtius Rufus in his judgment of Alexander.

Stoicism is the other philosophical movement that has been accused of a hostile attitude towards Alexander the Great.⁴ The Stoic School

¹Excerpts from Demetrius' treatise are found in Polybios (XXIX,21) and Diogenes Laertius (V.82).

²Further information on the treatment of the topic is presented in F. Wehrli, Die Schule des Aristoteles. (Texte und Kommentar, Vol. IV, Basel (1949), 57-58; and in A.A. Burkis, "The Sources of Plutarch's περὶ τύχης," Phoenix, IV (1950), 59-69.

³Cf. Plutarch, De Alexandri Magni Fortuna aut Virtute, and the article by A.E. Wardman, "Plutarch and Alexander," CQ, XLIX (1955), 96-107.

⁴Cf. W. Hoffmann, Das Literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen, 7-18; J. Stroux, Philologus, LXXXVIII (1933), 222-240; W.W. Tarn, "Alexander, Cynics and Stoics," AJPh. LX (1939), 41-70.

was founded about twenty years after the death of Alexander.¹ Its view of Alexander, therefore, was scarcely influenced by any personal contact between the king and important members of the school. Since Cynic teachings formed one of the roots of Stoicism, it appears possible, however, that the Stoic view of Alexander could have been inherited from the Cynics.

Information on Alexander's relation with the Cynics is usually connected with the names of two Cynic philosophers: Onesicritus of Astypalaea and his teacher, Diogenes of Sinope. Onesicritus took part in Alexander's campaigns. The role he played during these campaigns and the nature and extent of his writings on Alexander are issues that are still debated.² No evidence has been found that would indicate an hostile attitude towards Alexander on his part. L. Pearson states that, on the contrary, "all the evidence agrees that Onesicritus praised and even flattered Alexander."³

One version of the story that describes the contact between Alexander and the Gymnosophists, which sets the Macedonian king in a favourable light, goes back to Onesicritus. In his account, as reported by Strabo (XV. 58-66), Onesicritus tries to show Alexander as *βασιλεὺς φιλόσοφος*, and it is he himself who interviews this group of Indian philosophers on the instruction of Alexander. The statements

¹For information on Cynicism and Stoicism, see F. Coplestone, A History of Philosophy, Vol. I.

²Cf. L. Pearson, The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great, Chapter IV, where further biographical information is offered.

³Ibid., p. 87.

attributed to the Gymnosophists on this occasion are thoroughly Hellenistic in form and show a marked Cynic tendency.

This same episode, however, has been transmitted in a different tradition, which is known to us through Megasthenes' report in Strabo (XV,1,68) and a papyrus dated at about 100 B.C.¹ In this tradition Alexander appears as the ruthless conqueror and tyrant who amuses himself by posing difficult questions to the captured philosophers, on the answers to which their lives depend. The Gymnosophists, however, by their ingenuity compel Alexander to set them free.

This debate between Alexander and the Gymnosophists with their Cynic ideas and behaviour has a well-known parallel in the confrontation of Alexander with Diogenes of Sinope. Our earliest information of the meeting and conversation between king and Cynic philosopher is found in Cicero (Tusc.V.32,91). Most of our knowledge on Diogenes of Sinope, however, is derived from the writings of Diogenes Laertius who wrote about the first half of the third century A.D. In book XVI he reports different incidents which illustrate the relation between Alexander and Diogenes.² Although a meeting between Alexander and Diogenes might actually have happened, most critics feel that many anecdotes involving this meeting were invented to constitute an antithesis between the Cynic philosopher and the Macedonian king. Høistad is convinced that the creation of the antithesis Alexander-Diogenes belongs to the first half

¹The Pap. Berol. 13004 was first published and examined by U. Wilcken, "Alexander der Grosse und die indischen Gymnosophisten," SDAW, XXIII (1923), 150-183. For a further discussion of the whole problem, see G. Zuntz, "Zu Alexander's Gespräch mit den Gymnosophisten," Hermes, LXXXVII (1959), 436-440, and G. Chr. Hansen, "Alexander und die Brahmanen," Klio, XLIII (1965), 351-380.

²Cf. Diog. Laert, VI, 32; 38; 43; 44; 45; 60; 63; 68; 80.

of the third century B.C.¹ He believes that Alexander as well as Diogenes was still of topical interest at that time, and that "the historical and psychological conditions necessary for the emergence of the constellation Alexander the tyrant versus Diogenes the true king"² existed only then. Unless more and different evidence is found, Höistad's thesis seems to be acceptable.

The anecdotal material provided in Diogenes Laertius throws some light on the nature of the antithesis Alexander-Diogenes. It is not personal or political but rather philosophical in character. The whole context within which the anecdotes are reported points to their purpose: to describe and underline Diogenes' character and the main tenets of his Cynic philosophy. The emphasis is on Diogenes and not on Alexander. There is no pronounced hostility towards Alexander but the suggestion that, measured by Cynic standards, his power has no meaning.

We can expect that the theme 'philosopher versus tyrant' and its original application 'Diogenes versus Alexander' became a part of Cynic teaching and preaching. Plutarch's essay on Alexander and his praise of him as philosopher-king thus appears as a reaction to contrary philosophical opinions.³ Dio of Prusa in his fourth oration On Kingship has made the encounter between Alexander and Diogenes the starting point

¹R. Höistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King, Uppsala (1948), pp. 208-209.

²Ibid., p. 209.

³Plutarch, De Alexandri Magni Virtute et Fortuna. See also, A. Heuss, Antike und Abendland, IV, (1954), p. 95.

and basis of his discussion.¹ Both writers might be taken as witnesses of a continued debate.

How strongly Cynic teaching influenced the Stoic attitude towards Alexander, we do not know. We have no fragments of third century Stoics which refer to Alexander. W.W. Tarn, following the lead of Stroux,² suggests that Diogenes of Babylon, a disciple of Chrysippus, could have started the Stoic School on a new hostile view of Alexander. This assumption is based on information from Quintilian (Inst. orat. I. 1.9). The Roman writer in dealing with the influence of teachers upon their students offers the following example:

. . . Si quidem Leonides Alexandri paedagogus, ut a Babylonio Diogene traditur, quibusdam eum vitiis imbuit, quae robustum quoque et iam maximum regem ab illa institutione puerili sunt persecuta.

Stroux has attempted to show that the whole passage in Quintilian, where we find the above quotation from Diogenes belongs to an early, however, post-Chrysippean, Stoic writing *περὶ καίρων ἀγωγῆς*.³ For him the Leonidas-example is, therefore, not accidental information but part of a Stoic tradition.

Evidence indicative of the attitude of The Middle Stoa towards Alexander has been seen in a passage from Cicero (De Off. I.26.90). In

¹For the date and a detailed discussion of Dio's fourth oration, cf. R. Høistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King, 213-220.

²See W.W. Tarn, AJPh. LX (1939), p. 56 and J. Stroux, Philologus LXXXVIII (1933), p. 224.

³Stroux, ibid., pp. 224-227.

this work Cicero, as he himself confirms,¹ follows very closely the teachings of Panaetius. His judgment on Alexander in this passage, therefore, may well be the one of Panaetius or at least a reflection of his view. In a comparison between Philip and Alexander, Philip is said to have been in some respects superior to his son on account of his facilitas and humanitas. Cicero-Panaetius concludes the comparison by stating:

Itaque alter semper magnus, alter semper turpissimus, ut recte praecipere videantur qui monent, ut, quanto superiores simus, tanto nos geramus summissius.

The quotation of Diogenes in Quintilian and the view of Panaetius in Cicero form the basis for Stroux' attempt to reconstruct the Stoic portrait of Alexander. Both texts are subjected to a terminological analysis and set in the context of Stoic ethical theories and concepts. From this analysis and this perspective Stroux outlines the Stoic view of the king with the emphasis on the following two points: The cause of Alexander's faults is seen in the perverted education that he received from Leonidas, his paedagogus who did not curtail Alexander's *τῦφος* but encouraged it. The Stoics felt that Alexander did not deserve the predicate magnanimus, because he lacked the required facilitas et humanitas.

Plutarch's Alexander-essay serves again as witness--this time for the continuation of the hostile Stoic portrait into the second half of

¹Cicero, De Off. II. 17.60 and III. 2.7. For a discussion of Panaetius' influence on Cicero's work, see also Schanz-Hosius, Geschichte der Römischen Literatur, Vol. I, München (1927), 519-521.

²Höistad feels that in reproaching Alexander for his *τῦφος* Cynic and Stoic criticism are closely related. Cf. R. Höistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King, 211-212.

the first century A.D. The magnanimitas and magnitudo of Alexander is praised and defended against attacks.¹ Seneca has been acclaimed as another witness for a hostile Stoic tradition. Hoffmann has attempted to show that the unfavourable picture of Alexander in Seneca is based on traditional Stoic material.²

The Stoics like the members of Peripatetic School were not all or always concerned with Alexander's role in history.³ The very few references that have come down to us show their interest in him as a person who did not measure up to their ethical standards. Are we allowed then to infer from such reprobation of particular faults to a general judgment, or still more to infer from reprobation by a single philosopher to a judgment by the school to which this philosopher belonged? Stroux has tried to evaluate the meaning of the two important Stoic references to Alexander by placing them into the stream of Stoic ideas. Although this is a valid approach to the problem, the end-result of his examination does not seem to be an absolute proof for the existence of a consistent Stoic judgment on Alexander. Stroux has to make too many assumptions in his interpretation of the evidence, and the evidence itself appears to be too incidental to allow its placement into a definite system of thought.

The paucity and accidental nature of the testimony renders any

¹Cf. Plutarch, De Alexandri Magni fortuna aut virtute, (342F and 343B). Leonidas has found a positive appraisal in Plutarch, Alex. 5; 22; 25.

²Hoffmann, Das literarische Pórtret Alexanders des Grosse, p. 50.

³The relationship between Alexander's presumed concept for and Cynic and Stoic ideas about the unity of mankind is still much debated. Cf. M.H. Fisch, "Alexander and the Stoics," AJPh. LVIII (1937), 59-82; 129-151., W.W. Tarn, "Alexander, Cynics and Stoics," AJPh. LX (1939), 41-70.

attempt to properly evaluate the Alexander-criticism within the different philosophical traditions very difficult. Much of the evidence is presented in the form of anecdotes and thus remains necessarily superficial. It must also be noted that within the traditional accounts of Alexander that were transmitted into the Roman world, the philosophical judgment was mingled with a variety of other motives and tendencies. Any examiner of these traditions as they appear in Roman testimonies should be aware of their philosophical background. This awareness should not lead to hasty generalizations or classifications but should be related to the study of other motives influential in later criticism of Alexander.

Heuss, for example, in his estimate of the philosophical criticism against Alexander wants more emphasis to be placed on the search for an 'inner' motive behind this criticism. He sees this 'inner' motive in the following experience of the Hellenistic philosophers in their encounter with the phenomenon 'Alexander':

In Alexander hatte man erfahren, wie jahrhundertealte Ordnungen unter den Schlägen eines einzigen Menschen zusammenbrachen und sein alleiniger Wille Menschen und Völker als seine Geschöpfe zurecht modellierte. Dadurch war Alexander nicht nur zum unverlierbaren Begriff politischer Macht, sondern ebenso zum Kristallisationspunkt jeder möglichen Machtgeltungsansprüche geworden.¹

Given a similar experience, such a motive could become alive again and cause philosophers of another period to criticize through Alexander the abuse of political power in their own time. One must consider this factor, therefore, as important in the philosophical evaluation of Alexander in the early Roman empire as any set of traditional criticisms.

¹A. Heuss, Antike und Abendland, IV (1954), 74.

CHAPTER V

ALEXANDER-CRITICISM IN SENECA AND LUCAN

By reason of the scope and volume of his writings and of his influence on later European literature Seneca the Younger is one of the most important literary figures in the first century of the empire. His nephew Lucan also occupies a special position among the writers of the Silver Age. Vergil's epic achievement might have seemed to put an end to epic poetry. Lucan, however, had dared to follow Vergil in writing an epic poem and had dared to be different from tradition by dealing with a subject from fairly recent history. The civil war between Pompey and Caesar.

Both these authors, Seneca and Lucan, have described in their writings their attitude toward Alexander the Great. They were both singularly critical of him and attacked the memory of the king in the most forcible terms. The existing similarity of their views raises the question of possible influence by Seneca on Lucan and of the impact of traditional criticism in shaping the attitude of the two Roman writers toward Alexander. In addition, any exegesis of the Alexander-critique in Seneca and Lucan cannot but notice the added vehemence of the writers' personal feelings and convictions and will attempt to find possible explanations for these.

Seneca

The philosopher Seneca does not offer a historical view of

Alexander, nor does he present a comprehensive description of his personality. In none of his writings does Seneca deal with Alexander exclusively and alone. Statements on him are widely spread and found in many of Seneca's philosophical essays. To group these statements in accordance with the chronology of Seneca's works as we know it proves to be fruitless. Many of the assertions are similar, and no change or development in Seneca's view of Alexander is observable. Taken together all the references to Alexander in Seneca produce a thoroughly antagonistic picture of the Macedonian king.

Seneca's critique of Alexander revolves mainly around the following points: Alexander's mad craving for more and greater conquests is denounced on many occasions.¹ It is in the context of this specific criticism that Seneca launches his most violent attacks on Alexander. He is called vesanus adulescens, . . . latro gentium vastator, tam hostium pernicies quam amicorum (De ben. I, 13, 3); also a vesanus homo (Ep. 91.17), who is dominated by a furor aliena vastandi (Ep. 94.62). Alexander's desire to be compared to Liber and Hercules is being ridiculed by Seneca.² Whereas Hercules may rightly be called malorum hostis, bonorum vindex, terrarum marisque pacator (De ben. 1.13.3), Alexander has spread only terror and fear on his campaigns (De ben. 1.13.3) and behaved "like a wild beast that tears to pieces more than its hunger

¹See Seneca De clem. I.25.1; De ben. I.13.1-3; VII.2.5-6; VII.3.1; Ep. 53.10; Ep. 59.12; Ep. 91.17; Ep. 94.62-63; Ep. 119.7.

²De ben. I.13.1-3; VII.3.1; Ep. 94.63.

demands" (Ep. 94.62). Alexander's cruelty and ferocity knew no limits,¹ and his victories were achieved by his felix temeritas (De ben.I.13.3; VII.3.1). Socrates and Diogenes were superior to Alexander in many ways, since they were able to exercise greater self-control.² Compared to them Alexander was powerless and a helpless victim of his emotions.³ No one was as prone to anger as Alexander;⁴ nobody yielded to pride as much as he did.⁵ Seneca, therefore, speaks of him as a homo super mensuram humanae superbiae tumens (De ben. V.6.1) and even as a tumidissimum animal (De ben. II.16.2). Alexander's intemperance is also criticized.⁶ It was responsible not only for the death of his friend Clitus but for his own death as well.

The only positive statements on Alexander by Seneca refer to his military achievements (Ep. 113.29), his trust toward a friend (De ira II.23.2-3) and to his denial of his presumed divine origin (Ep. 59.12). The scant recognition given to Alexander in these references, however, is weakened by the critical tenor of the context in which they appear.⁷ Even Alexander's well-known liberalitas is vigorously criticized by the Roman philosopher.⁸

In his philosophical writings Seneca's interests centered largely

¹De clem.I.25.1; De ira III.17.1; III.23.1.

²Seneca, De ben. V.4, 3-4; V.6.1.

³Ep. 93,29; 119.7.

⁴De ira II.23.3.

⁵De ben. V.6.1; Ep. 53.10.

⁶Ep. 83.19 and 23.

⁷See especially De ira II.23.2-3; Ep. 113.29.

⁸De ben. II.16.1-2.

around the field of ethics. His discourses may even be called Stoic sermons. They are frequently informal in structure, lacking the marks of an ordered presentation but designed to be effective in the quickness of their appeal.¹ Examples and anecdotes from history were particularly suited to this style and were effectively used by Seneca.² It is mainly in the context of examples and anecdotes from his life that critical statements on Alexander are made by Seneca. In some instances examples of Alexander's behaviour appear isolated within the text; at other times they are presented within a carefully arranged series of other examples.³ Their main purpose is to illustrate and underline Seneca's arguments. In addition, however, the examples and anecdotes are frequently used by Seneca as starting-points for further reflection on and denunciation of Alexander's character.⁴

The material for these examples and illustrations was probably readily available to Seneca. As we have previously seen Valerius Maximus had produced a handbook for rhetoricians and orators with illustrative material. More than one of these collections of examples might have existed, with which Seneca came into contact in the course of his rhetorical training.⁵ There is also no reason to deny Seneca what Valerius

¹Comp. M. Grant, Roman Literature, London (1964), pp. 67-68.

²Compare the study by W. Trillitzsch, Senecas Beweisführung, Berlin (1962), especially 32-36.

³See especially Seneca, De ira, III.18.1; Ep. 94.63-64.

⁴See De ben. I.13.1-3; II.16.1-2; VII.2.5-6; Ep. 91.17; Ep. 94.62-63.

⁵For a thorough discussion of these 'rhetorical handbooks' see R. Helms, 'Valerius Maximus, Seneca and die 'Exemplasammlung'', Hermes, LXXIV (1939), 130-154.

Maximus claimed to have done: to collect examples through the reading of "famous authors".¹ The purpose of the rhetorical handbooks--to provide material for rhetoricians and orators on a variety of topics--necessitated its arrangement in certain patterns and a rather stereotyped presentation of the examples. The spark and color still had to be provided by the speaker or writer who used the material and had to fit it into the stream of his ideas and arguments. Thus the examples from the past could possibly be anchored to the present by the context in which they appeared and by the color that was given to them by the author. Seneca, too, must have been aware of this possibility.

Seneca the Younger was not a thinker isolated from the intellectual life and the philosophical movements of his time. He was deeply influenced by the rhetorical education of his day,² and his outlook on life was based on Stoic philosophy whose foremost Roman representative he became.³ Any exegesis of Seneca's statements on Alexander has to take this literary and philosophical background of the Roman moralist into account.

It has already been shown that the rhetorical as well as the Stoic tradition was not free of criticism directed toward the Macedonian king. A clear distinction between these two traditions in their influence on the critique of Alexander, however, will be difficult,

¹Val. Max. Pref.

²Seneca's rhetorical background is well described in W. Trillitzsch, Seneca's Beweisführung, 15-18.

³Seneca's place within the Stoic tradition is discussed in length by M. Pohlenz, Die Stoa, Gottingen, 1964, 282-327.

since the Stoic thinking of many Roman writers was frequently combined with the attitude and language of the rhetorician.¹

As has been stated Alexander's insane craving for further conquests, extending even beyond the Ocean, was a prominent object of Seneca's verbal attack on the king. The terms and images used by Seneca in this context are reminiscent of the first suasoria of his father, Seneca the Elder. In the suasoria as well as in Seneca's writings Ocean and Sun are described as the natural limits for Alexander's aspiration, which the king, however, always feels compelled to disregard.² The parallel Hercules-Alexander, especially as found in De ben. I.13.2., is already prepared for in Suas. I.1., as the following comparison might suggest:

Suas. I.1.: intra has terras caelum Hercules meruit;

De ben. I.13.2.: tanquam caelum. . . . teneret [Alexander],
quia Herouli aequabatur.

Seneca's violent denial of any greatness in Alexander as expressed in Ep. 91.17 sounds like a refutation of the following sententiae to be found in the first suasoria: Alexander orbi magnus est, Alexandro orbis angustus est (I.3) and orbis illum suus non capit (I.5). In the first suasoria Alexander is the subject of a deliberative exercise. Although no example has come down to us, he might also have been the subject of a denunciation exercise, in which his overweening ambition was censured, his conquest attributed to mere rapacity, his career regarded as

¹See the pertinent remarks by A.D. Leemann, Orationis ratio, Vol. I, p. 260.

²Compare Suas. I.2 and 3, Seneca, Ep. 94.63; 119,7.

ultimately a failure. The sententiae of such an exercise would probably have shown still greater similarity with Seneca's adverse and hostile comments on Alexander.

The influence of Seneca's rhetorical training extended not only to the contents of his critique but also to the language and style in which it was presented. The rhetorician's search for effect and impressiveness might have been partly responsible for the use of such expressions as latro gentiumque vastator, insatiabile gentium malum, and tumidissimum animal, which Seneca hurls at Alexander.

Stoic philosophy provided Seneca with an ethical system on the basis of which he then discussed questions of human behaviour. Many of these questions had been dealt with before and belonged to the store of traditional philosophical topics.¹ Seneca's ideas, therefore, were not always original contributions. His thought had been formed and influenced by the continuing stream of Stoic teaching and philosophizing.² As we have previously seen, Alexander's personality and career had been discussed within this Stoic tradition. Critics have assumed that the Stoic school was consistently hostile in their evaluation of Alexander.³ Seneca's criticism of the Macedonian king forms part of the evidence for their assumption. Parallels between elements in Seneca's critique and

¹Numerous references to these traditional topics are found in F. Wilhelm, Curtius und der jüngere Seneca, Paderborn, 1928, pp. 29, 73 and passim.

²For Seneca's place within the Stoic tradition see again M. Pohlenz, Die Stoa, 303-327.

³Compare Chapter IV of this study, where further references are given.

Stoic-Cynic views can indeed be drawn.¹ The comparison between Hercules and Diogenes on the one side and Alexander on the other side² owes much to Stoic-Cynic inspiration. Hercules and Diogenes had become the ideal representatives of Stoic and Cynic virtues.³ For Seneca Alexander did not only fail to measure up to their standards but in place of their virtues could only show felix temeritas (De ben. I.13.3.; VII.3.1.). Seneca seems to look upon Alexander as the embodiment of pride and vanity, hateful Stoic and Cynic vices, when he describes him as 'homo super mensuram humanae superbiae' (De ben. V.6.1) and 'tumidissimum animal' (De ben. II.16.2). Alexander, who yields to all passions and is dominated by them (Ep. 113.29-30), is far far remote from the Stoic ideal of ἀπάθεια .

Our inquiry seems to indicate that the unfavourable picture of Alexander as contained in Seneca points toward material from the rhetorical schools, and that it moves within a relatively fixed scheme of Stoic and Cynic ethical teachings. All literary and philosophical influence, however, should not per se exclude the possibility of specific contributions or accentuations on the part of Seneca himself. The Roman essayist was a creative writer, more than a mere copyist. In his use of source he has been characterized by E. Norden as follows:

Dieser Philosoph war ein viel zu grosser Meister in der Rhetorik, als dass bei seinen Expektorationen im eigentlichen

¹For the relationship between Stoic and Cynic views of Alexander see Chapter IV and Höistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King, 202-212.

²Compare Seneca, De ben. I.13.1-3; V.4.3; V.6.1; VII.3.1; Ep. 94.63.

³See Höistad, op. cit. passim.

Sinne von einer quellenmässigen Benutzung einer bestimmten Vorlage die Rede sein kann, es lassen sich selten mehr als die Hauptströmungen kennzeichnen, in denen er sich jedesmal bewegt.¹

W. Trillitzsch in his study of "Seneca's Beweisführung" concludes that "Seneca war ein Meister im Auswählen der wirkungsvollen künstlerischen und überhaupt für seine Zwecke tauglichen Elemente, um seine Leser zur sittlichen Besserung anzuregen und zu erziehen".² It is, therefore, unlikely, that Seneca--in his selection of material on Alexander--followed a completely schematic and colourless eclecticism. Within the context of his moral essays and the collection of his letters there are twenty-one references to Alexander's character or his career. The frequency of these--sometimes extensive--references would indicate Seneca's more than passing interest in Alexander. The violent verbal assault contained in most of the references attests to the nature of his interest. There is not only rhetorical 'fireworks' but a real attack on Alexander and on what Alexander's name stood for in the eyes of Seneca and his readers.

A theory might be advanced proposing that in the person of Alexander Seneca criticized in effect the bearers of supreme power in Rome, especially those whose cruelties and absurd behaviour he himself had experienced or observed. That Stoic political thought had no quarrel with monarchical rule as such has been shown.³ As for Seneca's position,

¹See E. Norden, Jahrbücher f. class. Philologie, Suppl. 19, 1893, p. 422, as quoted by W. Trillitzsch, Seneca's Beweisführung, p. 45 who emphasizes his agreement with Norden's evaluation.

²W. Trillitzsch, op. cit., p. 45.

³See D.R. Dudley, A History of Cynicism, London, 1937, p. 129.

we need only recall his famous sentence in De ben. II.20.2.--cum optimus status civitatis sub rege justo sit--, furthermore his picture of the ideal emperor, the servant and providence of his people, as it is described in his De Clementia and his Ad Polybium De Consolatione.¹ Seneca, however, must have been painfully aware that not all Roman rulers corresponded to his ideal but fitted rather his very own description of a tyrant.² Overt criticism of Roman emperors, especially of Gaius Caesar, is not absent in Seneca.³ The Apocolocyntosis, a satire on Claudius, is usually attributed to Seneca. W.H. Alexander has argued that even Seneca's Ad Polybium De Consolatione is a satire on the emperor Claudius. He suggests that in this case "overstress of laudation results in the acutest satire."⁴ Nobody would a priori deny the possibility of allusions in Seneca's works. Much of it, however, was probably intelligible to the initiated alone, while others could not discover the hidden point or only with difficulty. It would be difficult to prove that in a particular statement of Seneca the name of Alexander stands for the name of Gaius, Claudius or even Nero.⁵ Seneca's critique of Alexander is too

¹For Seneca's attitude towards monarchy see the study on his De Clementia by M. Fuhrmann, "Die Alleinherrschaft und das Problem der Gerechtigkeit" Gymnasium, LXX, 6, (1963), 481-514.

²Seneca, De clem. I.11.4--I.13. passim.

³Seneca, De ira, I.20.8; II.32. 2ff.; III.19.3. ff.; III.18.3.; De const. sap. XVIII.1.

⁴W.H. Alexander, "Seneca's Ad Polybium De Consolatione: A Reappraisal," Transact. Royal Soc. of Canada, XXXVII, (1943), p. 50.

⁵See annotation 4 in W. Hoffmann, Das literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen, p. 51.

closely associated with examples from the life of the Macedonian king and too deeply embedded in the language and thought of the rhetorical and Stoic tradition as to allow such a definite identification. The extent and intensity of Seneca's criticism, however, might well be a reflection of his awareness of Roman conditions and of Rome's totalitarian climate.

Lucan

Lucan, the nephew and contemporary of Seneca, is the other Roman writer, whose strong indictment of Alexander the Great has come down to us. His epic on the Civil War contains more than one reference to Alexander. Most of these references, however, are insignificant as to Lucan's view of the Macedonian conqueror. Lucan's sharp and extensive denunciation of Alexander's character and achievements is to be found in the tenth book of his poem (X,20-52). It appears in the following context: Book IX has closed with the arrival of Caesar in the harbour of Alexandria, where he refuses to approve the murder of Pompey. The next book then opens with his landing in Egypt and his visit to the tomb of Alexander; but neither the visit nor Caesar's reactions are actually described by the poet. The Roman leader, Lucan tells us, made a rapid tour of the city. Paying little attention to the ancient temples and shrines of the city, Caesar eagerly goes down into the vault of Alexander's tomb. The poet's verbal attack on Alexander follows immediately. With verse 53 the main story is resumed with the introduction of Ptolemy and Cleopatra.

Lucan's invective may be outlined as follows:

Verses, 20-28: Alexander is called felix praedo, who has destroyed liberty in many parts of the world. For these actions the "mad son of Philip" was spared full retribution, since his body has been saved. It should have been torn apart and scattered all over the world as a reminder of his tyranny.

Verses, 28-45: In these verses Alexander's career is summarized, his furor exemplified. He has left his homeland and Greece and by slaughtering the peoples of Asia, he stained the Euphrates and Ganges with the blood of Persians and Indians. In his madness he had made plans to march across the whole earth. No obstacle could stop him. He was prepared to sail upon the Ocean itself. Through his death Nature itself put a limit to his boundless ambition--something which the earth itself had not been able to do. His envy was so great, that rather than leave his empire for another to rule, he left it to be torn apart.

Verses, 46-52: In the final verse reluctant praise is given to Alexander, and Rome brought back into the picture. Rome's great power is showing itself inferior to Alexander's. The peoples of the East had feared the Macedonian pikes more than they now feared the Roman javelins.

It is not idle speculation to assume that Seneca exercised some influence on Lucan in shaping his view of Alexander. That literary contact between uncle and nephew existed has been proven.¹ A comparison between Seneca's Alexander-critique and Lucan's denunciation suggests some possible parallels. The adjective 'vesanus', which Lucan uses to

¹See G. Pfligersdorffer, "Lucan als Dichter des geistigen Widerstandes," Hermes LXXXVII, (1959), 373-377.

describe Alexander (X,20;X,42) is also very prominent in Seneca: 'vesanus ille adulescens' (De ben. I.13.2), 'vesanus Alexander' (De ben. II.16.1), and 'vesanus homo' (Ep. 91.17). Lucan's condemnation of Alexander as 'terrarum fatale malum' (X,34) seems to echo Seneca's indictment of him as 'insatiabile gentium malum' (De clem. I.25.1). And again Lucan's expression 'felix praedo' (X.21) is reminiscent of Seneca's phrases 'felix temeritas' (De ben. I.13.1), 'a pueritia latro' (De ben. I.13.3) and 'Alexandri latrocinia' (nat. quaest. III. praef.5), which he uses in his characterization of Alexander.

These verbal parallels in Seneca and Lucan point toward a similarity in their view of Alexander, which has to be considered, however, in the light of their common literary and philosophical background. Like Seneca, Lucan was influenced by his rhetorical training,¹ and with his uncle he shared the belief in the basic tenets of Stoic philosophy.² Many of the references to the Stoic background and the influence of the rhetorical schools in the interpretation of Seneca's critique, therefore, apply to Lucan's indictment of Alexander as well.

The rhetorical qualities of Lucan's style have always attracted notice, and, in fact, Quintilian suggested that his Bellum Civile was more appropriate for the instruction of orators than of poets.³ It has been felt that the very nature of his poetry had been greatly affected

¹This influence has been shown by St. F. Bonner, "Lucan and the Declamation Schools," AJPh. LXXXVII (1966), 257-289.

²On the influence on Stoicism on Lucan, compare especially B.M. Marti, "The Meaning of the 'Pharsalia'," AJPh. LXVI (1945), 352-376.

³Quintillian, Inst. orat. X.1.90.

by his rhetorical style, and the ideals and conventions of epic poetry thus falsified.¹ Other critics have accepted this judgment only with reservation. They have made allowance for a legitimate mutual influence between poetry and rhetoric as being in accord with the spiritual climate of Lucan's time.² In a recent study M.P.O. Morford has claimed that Lucan should not be blamed so much for a break with epic conventions but should rather be held responsible for the creation of a rhetorical epic which "permits the inclusion of extraneous disquisitions whose connection with the main development of the epic hardly justifies (in our view) their length".³ Morford then describes this element of the 'new rhetorical' epic as follows:

These episodes had to be carefully composed; they had to display knowledge of the literary tradition and a knowledge, often very detailed, of the subject being dealt with. In style they had to be, if possible, dramatic and colourful, vibrant with hyperbole and epigram.⁴

The excursus on Alexander in the Bellum Civile is considered by Morford as one of these episodes which demonstrates how Lucan's rhetorical training affected the development of his epic art. Rhetorical influence can definitely be found in the structure of Lucan's invective.

H. Christensen has shown that the excursus may be classified as a vituperatio, and that--in its essential elements--it corresponds closely

¹For a survey on this criticism see O. Steen Due, "An Essay on Lucan," C&M. XXIII (1962), 75-86, and passim.

²See O. Steen Due, ibid., 68-75.

³M.P.O. Morford, The Poet Lucan, Oxford, 1967, p. 87.

⁴Morford, ibid., p. 87.

to such a rhetorical denunciation.¹ Lucan's reflections on Alexander have been criticized as another case of the poet's "tendency to run off at length into a sermon where what was needed was one or two powerful touches, such as stimulate a reader to make the sermon for himself".² Morford, on the other side, does not think of Lucan's denunciation as a superfluous digression but feels that by the time the poet came to compose the tenth book he "had sufficient mastery of his epic material to be able to insert such a locus where it could best be integral to the structure of the poem".³ The possible significance of Lucan's passage will have to be found in the light of its relationship to the underlying theme of the poem and to the character of Caesar, with whose name and actions it is linked through its context.

The question of the underlying theme has not found the same answers among scholars.⁴ Different themes have been suggested that--in the opinion of their advocates--fulfill the essential requirement, namely to provide unity and purpose to Lucan's poem. A discussion of the different suggestions is beyond the scope of this study. Most of the proposed themes, even if they have not found full acceptance as being the primary theme, suggest some basic points of view to be found in the

¹H. Christensen, "Alexander der Grosse bei den römischen Dichtern," Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, 12. Jahrg. (1909), 122-123.

²See W.E. Heitland in the introduction to M.A. Lucani, Pharsalia, ed. by C.E. Haskins, London, 1887, LXXVI.

³Morford, op. cit., p. 13.

⁴A good survey of the different theories can be found in O. Steen Due, "An Essay on Lucan," 87-88.

Bellum Civile. They will briefly be enumerated here to help in the understanding of the Alexander-denunciation in book X.

H.C. Nutting claims that the vital issue throughout the epic "is between 'liberty' and 'tyranny'", and that to 'Libertas' personified falls the role of the heroine in the poem.¹ Pompey is seen as the champion of Libertas against the assaults of Caesar. For Nutting, Lucan has treated the idea of libertas rather as an academic theme, as an effective subject for declamation. Other scholars feel that Lucan's involvement reached much deeper, and that the theme must have been of vital interest to the Romans of his day. G. Pfligersdorffer comes to the conclusion that "der Sinn des Werkes in der Haltung des geistigen Widerstandes gesucht werden müsste".² According to him Lucan's real intention was to describe man's resistance against a world that is in the process of destroying the old Roman values and ideals. The poem, therefore, shows a steadily growing enthusiasm for the republican idea. It contains frequent attacks on monarchism, so that O. Schönberger does not hesitate to call the epic a "Tendenzepos gegen die Monarchie".³ The 'horror of the civil war' is seen by E.M. Sanford as the idea of the poem, i.e. its uniting intention and purpose.⁴ For O. Steen Due the fundamental theme of the poem is "patria ruens" (IX.385), the downfall

¹H.C. Nutting, "The Hero of the Pharsalia," AJPh. LIII, (1932), 41-52.

²G. Pfligersdorffer, "Lucan als Dichter des geistigen Widerstandes," Hermes LXXXVII. (1959), p. 364.

³O. Schönberger, "Zu Lucan. Ein Nachtrag," Hermes, LXXXVI, (1958), p. 232.

⁴E.M. Sanford, "Lucan and Civil War," CP XXVIII, (1933), 121-127.

and the destruction of the old Rome.¹ The Civil War--according to him--is seen by Lucan as part of the general struggle between Tyranny and Liberty and then more specifically as "the struggle between Caesarians and Pompeians, between the old republican and the new imperial Rome."²

The main ideas and themes in the Bellum Civile are closely connected with and represented by the character and actions of three persons: Pompey, Cato the Younger and Caesar.³ Cato receives the unlimited and emphatic admiration of the poet as the symbol and representative of the Roman-Stoic virtus.⁴ Pompey occupies a prominent place in books four to eight. His characterization changes in accordance with his growth toward perfection, which he reaches, however, only at the moment of his death.⁵ As to the portrait of Caesar in the poem the opinion of scholars is unanimous: he is seen and described by Lucan as the embodiment of wickedness and vice. "In Caesar," B.M. Marti writes, "Lucan has created a superhuman figure endowed in almost equal degree with all the sins, an example of evil, the incarnation of abstract Sinfulness."⁶ Caesar cannot endure superiority in another man (I.125).

¹O. Steen Due, "An Essay on Lucan," p. 120.

²Ibid., p. 132.

³E.M. Sanford has demonstrated that the whole discussion on the hero of the poem has been established on false foundations. See E.M. Sanford, op. cit., passim.

⁴See G. Pfligersdorffer, "Lucan als Dichter des geistigen Widerstandes," 349-354.

⁵Compare O. Steen Due, op. cit., 109-120.

⁶B.M. Marti, "The Meaning of the Pharsalia," p. 364.

Even after he has been loaded with the triumphs of victory, he feels frustrated (V. 666f.). For him the whole extent of the Roman world is not enough (X.456f.). No victory can satisfy his impulsive haste (III.50ff.). He is always pursuing the unattainable. As destructive as the elements, he rejoices in devastation, in ruining lands with fire and sword (II.440). From this brief outline Caesar's boundless ambition and desire to dominate the world presents itself as a key element in Lucan's unfavourable treatment of Caesar.

Related to the prominent themes in the Bellum Civile the vituperatio Alexandri gains life and significance. In the person of Alexander Lucan denounces monarchy that turns into tyranny, the destruction of law and liberty, the nefarious maximum of human power and ambition that ultimately leads to the downfall of nations and peoples. After the battle at Pharsalus and the death of Pompey, Caesar was also at the height of his power. In his powerful position and in his ambition to dominate the world he resembled Alexander. As the poet describes how Caesar rushes to the tomb of Alexander--nulla captus dulcedine rerum (X. 17)--the reader is forced to associate him with Alexander.¹ The denunciation of the man who imposed his sole will upon the world applies to Caesar as well, as he now seeks to satisfy his ambition. By juxtaposing the figures of the two world-conquerors and freedom-destroyers, Lucan achieves a stronger picture of Caesar than he would by describing him.

¹It is necessary to recall Caesar's desire to be compared to Alexander. See J.B. Nadell, Alexander and the Romans, Chapter IV.

B.M. Marti, who considers Lucan's work to be basically a Stoic poem, has suggested another reason that might substantiate the Alexander-Caesar parallel in the Civil War. In regard to the principal heroes of the poem her main thesis is that Caesar and Cato "are two superhuman, almost allegorical figures, standing at either pole of the dualistic ethical system of Stoicism, as uncompromising as darkness and light."¹ But whereas Cato has been added to the list of traditional Stoic heroes by the Romans, "Caesar does not seem to have exemplified wickedness"² for them. Alexander, however, was known in the Stoic tradition as the incarnation of wickedness.³ Lucan, Miss Marti states, "by this pairing of Caesar and Alexander in conjunction, was attempting to introduce Caesar among the traditionally wicked men".⁴

Although Lucan's poem is pervaded by Stoicism, one might find it difficult to follow Miss Marti in giving Lucan's epic a strong and coherent Stoic theory as exclusive basis.⁵ The dualistic viewpoint, however, might well apply and might have caused Lucan to think of Alexander as a prototype of Caesar.

Lucan wrote of a war that--as a historical event--was a century past. He tells us, however, that all succeeding generations are involved

¹B.M. Marti, op. cit., p. 358.

²Ibid., p. 363..

³For the evidence on this point Miss Marti relies heavily on Seneca's critique of Alexander. Comp. op. cit., p. 362.

⁴Ibid., p. 363.

⁵Compare the criticism by O. Steen Due, "An Essay on Lucan," 108-109.

in "the never-ending contest between Freedom and Caesar" (VII.695). For his generation this Caesar was Nero, and Lucan's work was written--in many aspects--from the perspective of the Neronian period.¹ From this viewpoint the attack on Caesar became a prolonged attack on Caesarism as such. Behind Lucan's Caesar one might see the picture of Nero.² Exploiting the double ambiguity of their names and functions, Lucan could hint at the close correspondence between one evil Caesar and the other, without openly identifying the two. In this context Lucan's indictment of Alexander in book X might not have been without contemporary relevance. It is, however, difficult to detect definite references to Nero. The poet Lucan knew his audience, and he must have been aware that if there was the slightest possibility of interpreting something as an allusion it would be done. Yet, he was the more sure of applause if he could offer an ambiguity in an ingenious and discreet way. Thus the expression--sidus iniquum gentibus (X.35)--with which he describes Alexander, might have reminded his readers of Nero, since Suetonius tells us that the appearance of a comet caused the emperor to indulge in new acts of cruelty and killing.³

The last few lines of the Alexander-passage, in which Lucan points to Alexander's superiority as compared to Rome's failure against the Parthians, suggest a more definite contemporary connotation. Corbulo's

¹Evidence is offered by O. Schönberger, "Zu Lucan. Ein Nachtrag," p. 233.

²The relationship between Nero and Lucan, especially as it presents itself in the poem, is discussed extensively by O. Steen Due, op. cit., 87-106.

³Suet, Nero, XXXVI.

military success in Armenia had been turned into a threatrical performance through Nero's dealings with the kings of Armenia and Parthia.¹ As a result the Parthians remained free and independent of Roman rule. The failure to achieve a permanent conquest by Rome can be credited to Nero.² In this particular criticism, as in his handling of the 'eastern question' generally, Lucan's attitude might reflect "the influence of . . . [his] intransigent republicanism and of the discussion of current foreign policy among the members of the Pisonian conspiracy."³

Although an analysis of Lucan's passage does not establish many direct contemporary references, the tenor of the speech gives evidence to the poet's involvement. Lucan's attack on Alexander seems to be born not only out of hostility against the first Caesar but also out of his bitterness against the Neronian autocracy of his own day. The excursus on Alexander allowed the poet, restricted as he was by the political situation in which he himself was engaged, to use the color of a rhetorical topic to express the intensity of his own experience.

In their critique of Alexander Seneca and Lucan resemble each other in many ways. Both writers are strongly hostile to Alexander and allow only scant recognition for him. The influence of the rhetorical schools on their criticism is undeniable. The schools have--in the

¹For a discussion of Nero's eastern policy cf. J. Bishop, Nero - The Man and the Legend, New York, 1964, 131-146.

²Here Nero's attempts to imitate Alexander, especially in the context of his eastern plans, should be recalled. Cf. Chapter I.

³E.M. Sanford, "The Eastern Question in Lucan's Bellum Civile," in Classical and Medieval Studies Presented to E.K. Rand, New York, 1938, 255.

topics and color of their exercises--provided material which is used by Seneca as well as Lucan. Both authors have been affected by Stoic criticism of Alexander and have used Stoic terminology and ideas to express their views of him. This common background makes it difficult to assess the direct influence of Seneca upon Lucan's portrait of Alexander, although a terminological comparison suggests such an influence.

A striking aspect of Seneca's and Lucan's criticism is the vigour and venom with which it is presented. There is more than a repetition of rhetorical and philosophical clichés. The added emphasis must relate to the political situation in the empire of which Seneca and Lucan were painfully aware or even actively opposed to. It is easier to detect possible contemporary relevance in the work of Lucan than in the writings of Seneca. Seneca's critical statements are widely distributed and appear in the context of different philosophical discussions. Lucan's critique, on the other side, appears within the structure of his epic poem and can be related to its underlying themes and to the character of one of its principal figures. From the criticism of both writers, however, the impression is gained, that the evil memory of Alexander's character and career is evoked and denounced not only as an example from the past but as an indication of a present possibility or even reality.

CHAPTER VI

THE ALEXANDER-PORTRAIT OF QUINTUS CURTIUS RUFUS

The Historiae Alexandri Magni Regis Macedonum by Q. Curtius Rufus is the only Latin monograph on the Macedonian king which has come down to us. It enjoyed great popularity during the Middle Ages, as the abundance of manuscripts from that time proves. During the last fifty years the opinion on Curtius' work has varied greatly, alternating between high praise and extreme rejection.¹ As far as we can make out, the writers and grammarians of classical times have remained silent about Curtius, and the date of the Historiae is not definitely known. The resulting lack of knowledge on the Latin author has made an evaluation of his work more difficult, and many problems are still unsolved.² Some of these problems are touched upon in this chapter, whose main purpose, however, is to investigate into Curtius' portrait of Alexander the Great.

The manuscripts of the Historiae indicate Q. Curtius Rufus as the author of the work. No other writing of his is known or even referred to. No details of Curtius' life are offered within the text of his history as it has come down to us. Unfortunately, of the ten books into which the work was divided, the first two, which might have contained some information on the writer's identity, motivation and sources, are

¹A survey of opinion is offered in Q. Curtius Rufus, Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen, Lateinisch und Deutsch von K. Müller und H. Schönfeld, München, 1954, 806-811.

²Most of these problems are reviewed by H. Bardon, "Quinte Curce," LEC, XV. (1947), 3-14; 120-137; 193-220.

completely lost. Other gaps occur at the end of book V and the beginning of book VI, and there is an additional break in the last book. Attempts to relate the author's name to the person of the proconsul Curtius Rufus who is mentioned by Tacitus and Pliny¹ or to the orator Q. Curtius Rufus from Suetonius' list of famous rhetors,² have produced no definite conclusions.³

The question of the date when Curtius' history of Alexander was written has long been debated and cannot be said to have been settled definitely.⁴ From the Historiae two indications can be derived: Curtius lived under a princeps,⁵ and he wrote while the Parthian Empire was still in existence, that is before 227 A.D. In book VI.2.12 the authors tells us that the Parthians--at the time of his writing--rule over all the people "who dwell beyond the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers and extend as far as the Red Sea". This statement would seemingly place the terminus ante quem of Curtius' work before the rule of Trajan, who made the decisive break with the traditional acceptance of the Euphrates as the frontier between the Roman and Parthian empires. It is, therefore, the

¹Cf. Tac. Ann. XI.20-21; Plin. Ep. VII.27.2-3.

²Suet. De rhet. et gramm. praef. I.

³Possible reasons for the identifications and further references to this problem are offered by K. Glaser, "Curtius und Claudius," WS. LX (1942), 87-92.

⁴The whole problem has been discussed extensively in an unpublished dissertation by D. Korzeniewski, Die Zeit des Quintus Curtius Rufus, Köln, 1959. Korzeniewski deals with all important previous suggestions and offers further references. His dissertation has been reviewed by R.T. Bruere, CPh. LV (1960), 266-268 and by A.B. Breebart, Mnemosyne, XVII (1964), 431-433.

⁵Compare Curt. X. 9.3.

consensus of modern scholars that Curtius' date falls within approximately the first hundred years of the Principate, from Augustus to Vespasian.

Many attempts have been made to determine more closely within those limits the time when Curtius' history was written. The basis for most discussions has been a passage in book X.9. 1-7, where the author interrupts his narrative to comment briefly on the situation in the Roman Empire at his own time. Curtius has told us before, that civil wars have threatened the Macedonian nations, because monarchical rule cannot be shared. The empire which might have flourished under one ruler went down to ruin when ruled by many. Then meditating on the Roman situation the author continues:

Proinde iure meritoque populus Romanus salutem se principi suo debere profitetur, qui noctis quam paene supremam habuimus novum sidus illuxit. Huius, hercule, non solis, ortus lucem caliganti reddidit mundo, cum sine suo capite discordia membra trepidarent. Quot ille tum exstinxit faces! quot condidit gladios! quantam tempestatem subita serenitate discussit! Non ergo revirescit solum, sed etiam floret imperium. Absit modo invidia, excipiet huius saeculi tempora eiusdem domus utinam perpetua, certe diuturna posteritas.

The interpreter of this passage has the task to define the concrete historical situation to which the author's sentiments apply. The rhetorical and panegyric style employed in the aside renders this task very difficult. It seems nearly impossible to determine when the apparently timeless metaphorical clichés in the text constitute a reference to actual events. As a result of this great difficulty so many different answers to the question of the date of the Historiae have been given. Curtius' statements and phrases, because of their general tenor and indeterminate connotation, seem to fit more than one historical situation

as it is known to us. They have consequently been applied to events in the reign of the emperors Augustus, Claudius, and Vespasian. To none of these events do they correspond in all details.¹ In his review of Korzeniewski's dissertation A.B. Breebaart concludes "Die ganze Frage wird wohl nie gelöst werden, weil gerade solche Indizien fehlen, welche eine eindeutige Beziehung auf konkrete historische Ereignisse zulassen".²

Other evidence testifying to the date of Curtius' work has been looked for in possible parallels between the Historiae and the writings of other authors; and in general considerations relating to the style, language and content of the work. In regard to the first approach the relationship between Seneca the Younger and Curtius has frequently been examined. This relationship has in fact been the subject of a special study by F. Wilhelm.³ He has found no evidence that Seneca knew of Curtius and used him, or that Curtius borrowed from Seneca.⁴ For him their common ideas and points of contact can be explained by reference to the traditional literary and philosophical influence and similar training.

An affinity between the style and language of Livy and Curtius has been found by many scholars.⁵ In the relationship between the two

¹A comparison of the different theories and the respective criticism makes this point very clear.

²Cf. A.B. Breebaart, Mnemosyne, XVII (1964), p. 433.

³Fr. Wilhelm, Curtius und der jüngere Seneca, Paderborn, 1928.

⁴Cf. Ibid., 73-74.

⁵For an extensive comparison between Livy and Curtius see R.B. Steele, "Quintus Curtius Rufus," AJPh. XXXVI (1915), 402-423.

writers Curtius has been assigned the role of the borrower. His style is said to have "that flow which is the characteristic feature of the Livian tradition."¹ In this context Curtius' language is praised as being "lucid and of virtually classical purity", although traces of Silver Latinity are not absent.² Evidence of Livy's influence on Curtius still does not allow any definite conclusion as to the date of the Historiae. A great writer such as Livy was not limited in his influence to his own time and, in fact, he caused admiration and imitation among later historians.³ His influence might have been felt, however, more strongly by writers close to his own time. The near classical quality that scholars find in Curtius' language seems also to exclude a very late date for the writing of his history.

Like many other writers of the Early Empire Curtius was unable or probably did not want to free himself from the powerful influence of rhetoric. In the judgment of E. Norden, the rhetorical element in Curtius extends to the content of his work--the many speeches, the dramatic narrations, the psychological analysis--rather than to his language.⁴ He holds no extreme position within the development of rhetorical historiography. The rhetorical features of Curtius' style are not so exceptional and distinguished as to allocate to him a definite place

¹A.D. Leeman, Orationis ratio, Vol. I, p. 255.

²Compare Moses Hadas, A History of Latin Literature, New York, 1952, p. 239 and E. Norden, Die römische Literatur, Leipzig, 1961, 6th. edition, p. 91.

³A.D. Leeman, op. cit., chapter X.

⁴Compare E. Norden, Antike Kunstprosa, Stuttgart, 1958, Reprint, 304-305.

within a limited period in the development of Latin literature.

It has been said that "Curtius' date cannot be decided by style--few questions of fact can".¹ Our brief look at the basic characteristics of Curtius' language and style seems to confirm this opinion. The lack of certainty and precision in all considerations relating to the style and language of the Historiae as well as in the presumed literary parallels makes it difficult to use them as temporal indices.

The majority among scholars seems to favour the time of the emperor Claudius as the date for the Historiae Alexandri Magni.² However, the hypothetical nature of this view has to be remembered, especially, when it serves as a basis for further interpretation of Curtius' tendencies and motivations.

Arrian tells us that a large number of historians wrote about Alexander.³ Many of their histories must have been accessible to Curtius Rufus and were used by him. If they were accessible to us in the same degree, we would be able to assess to what extent they were valued and creatively employed by the Roman writer. Such an assessment would help our understanding of Curtius and would make his intentions transparent to us. Unfortunately, few of these histories have come down to us at all and then mostly in fragmentary form. Curtius himself is not very generous with references to his authors. He may have been more explicit in the beginning of his work, which is, however, lost to us. Within the

¹W.W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, Vol. II, p. 112, 4n.

²See the survey of the different opinions and theories in the work of D. Korzeniewsky, Die Zeit des Quintus Curtius Rufus, 14-31.

³Arrian, Anab. Praef. 2.

extent parts of Historiae there are only two passages where Curtius names his authorities: in both Clitarchus is mentioned (IX.5.21; IX.8.15), and in one of them Timagenes and Ptolemy as well (IX.5.21).

Many studies have been devoted to the question of Curtius' sources. Referring to these studies H. Bardon remarks: "L'incertitude des données initiales n'a d'égale, trop souvent, que celle des résultats."¹

A discussion of the problem of Curtius' sources is not intended here. It is generally assumed that the author used a great variety of sources, and that--consequently--he was exposed to divergent influences. Much of his material has been attributed to a tradition that centered around the name of Callisthenes and presented a generally favourable account of Alexander. It came down to Curtius mainly through the writings of Clitarchus and possibly Timagenes, as well as other secondary sources and underwent modification. The more reliable sources for which Arrian later showed a definite emphasis--namely Aristobulus and Ptolemy--are also used in Curtius, as comparisons between the two writers have shown.² Tarn claims for Curtius the use of a so-called 'mercenaries' source' and of an unknown work on Macedonian laws and customs.³ Curtius was also influenced by the contributions of the rhetorical schools⁴ and the philosophical debates that touched upon the

¹H. Bardon, "Quinte-Curce Historien," LEC. XV (1947), p. 120. Bardon discusses the problem of Curtius' sources and evaluates previous studies. Also very important for the study of Curtius' sources are: W.W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, Vol. II, passim and L. Pearson, The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great, Philological Monographs, XX, Amer. Philol. Assoc. 1960.

²See H. Bardon, "Quinte-Curce," LEC. XV. (1947), 126-127.

³W.W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, Vol. II. 105-107.

⁴See H. Bardon, op. cit., 124-126.

character and career of Alexander the Great. This last influence might have reached Curtius in the form of oral traditions which never received expression in formal published writing but only in lectures and debates.¹

The brief outline above indicates the main but certainly not all the possible sources available to Curtius. The Roman writer has been strongly criticized for the way he handled and employed these sources. E. Schwartz has denied him any value as historian.² W. Kroll follows Schwartz in his negative verdict on Curtius. He calls him "eine Mittelmässigkeit ohne individuelle Züge", an entertainer, who reaches his aim "durch psychische Sensationen, Abwechslung und Vermeidung alles trockenen und fachmännischen Details".³

For a more recent evaluation of Curtius we have to refer to W.W. Tarn. Tarn sees in Curtius "a virtuoso", who wants to show his cleverness but lacks "interest in his subject".⁴ Referring to Curtius' statement in book IX.1.34, he accuses him of a "complete lack of historical principle".⁵ Still he finds in Curtius the "making of a critic, if he

¹To assume the existence of such oral traditions does certainly not mean that their content can be described in details.

²Compare E. Schwartz, Griechische Geschichtsschreiber, Leipzig, 1959, 168-169. The chapter on Curtius is a reprint of the article on the Roman writer in RE IV (1901) s.v. Curtius, 1879-1880.

³W. Kroll, Studien zum Verständnis der Römischen Literatur, Stuttgart, 1924, p. 331.

⁴W. W. Tarn, op. cit., p. 92.

⁵W. W. Tarn, op. cit., p. 92. Compare Curt. IX.1.34; "Equidem plura transcribo quam credo; nam nec affirmare sustineo de quibus dubito, nec subducere quae accepi".

had taken his history seriously".¹ Even Tarn cannot help but concede that "invaluable pieces of information are embedded in his rhetoric" and "that it was meant to be a serious history and not a work of entertainment".² Unfortunately, Curtius does not measure up to what--in Tarn's opinion--should be the standards of 'serious' history.

Nobody can deny that there are numerous errors and weaknesses in the Historiae. Curtius' geography is not infrequently at fault, his accounts of military operations are less than satisfying, his chronological arrangement at times incoherent and vague, his narrations occasionally lack important details.³ Many of these defects, however, lie on the surface of Curtius' work and do not warrant its total rejection. When examined in accordance with the standards of ancient and not of modern historical inquiry they appear less severe. In reference to these standards it may also be noted that Curtius' statement in book IX. 1.34 noted above--branded by Tarn as extreme cynicism⁴--does not differ greatly from Livy's confession (I. praef. 6): "quae ante conditam conditam condendamve Urbem poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis traduntur ea nec adfirmare nec refellere in animo est."

A more balanced approach to Curtius will neither deny his faults

¹W.W. Tarn, ibid., p. 94.

²Ibid., p. 129.

³Examples are given by H. Bardon, "Quinte-Curce", LEC.XV (1947), 128-131. Bardon's criticism of Curtius in this context is surprisingly mild. See also Pearson's evaluation of Curtius in his work: The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great, p. 217.

⁴W. W. Tarn, op. cit., p. 92.

and weaknesses nor hastily agree to accuse him of complete incompetence, distincerest and cynicism.

After a thorough but fair discussion of the mistakes and defects observed in the Historiae Bardon finds Curtius nevertheless motivated by an "inquiétude du vrai".¹ Balancing the negative and positive factors in Curtius' work the French scholar concludes: "Il a écrit une histoire vraie, vraie dans sa perspective, si non toujours exact dans son detail".² Such an evaluation indicates the need for a further study of Curtius that is guided not by foregone conclusions but by "sympathie admirative".³

The portrait of Alexander the Great constitutes a main theme in the Historiae. Curtius' conception of his hero's character furnishes understandably an element of great interest to his critics. The Roman author has been praised for helping us to perceive through his description "le battement d'une grande ame".⁴ But he has also been severely criticized for offering us a picture of Alexander, which consists of "durcheinandergeworfene Trümmer" only.⁵ Is there a basis for such an extreme difference in opinion? The answer to this question has to be provided primarily by a study of Curtius' narration itself.

One does not need to read far in the existing Latin text of the Historiae before Alexander is characteristically brought into focus. He cuts the Gordian knot; and the will-power and self-confidence thereby displayed is soon triumphantly seizing the passes of Cilicia, winning the battle of Issus, and capturing the Persian queen and queen-mother

¹H. Bardon, op. cit., p. 131.

²Ibid., p. 134.

³Ibid., p. 220.

⁴Ibid., p. 134.

⁵E. Schwartz, Griechische Geschichtsschreiber, p. 169.

(Book III).¹ It is the vigour and energy of Alexander that stands out in Curtius' description of these events. He is the moving force behind all activities. When illness weakens the king, all movements stop, fear befalls the army (III.5.1ff.), and success seems far away. With the recovery of Alexander's health, the soldiers are ready for battle again (III.6.17). The battle of Issus itself shows Alexander's supreme ability as general and also his own personal courage and example during the fighting (III.11.7). After the battle Alexander proves himself to be a noble victor. He cares for the burial of the dead, visits his royal Persian captives, giving an example of compassion and continence (III.12.1ff.).

In book IV Curtius continues the description of Alexander's activities. The city of Tyre falls after a long siege-operation, which calls for many inventions and adjustments. In Egypt Alexander visits the oracle of Jupiter-Ammon and is declared the god's son. He then founds Alexandria. On his return into Asia Alexander defeats king Darius at the battle of Arbela (Guagamela). The siege of Tyre strained the king's patience, but also demonstrated his determination and inventiveness, and once again his bravery in battle (IV.4.10f.). The exchange of letters between the Macedonian king and Darius during this period indicated Alexander's growing awareness of his power and his claim for absolute domination. In Curtius' description Alexander welcomes his elevation through the oracle which seems to sanction his claims. Curtius himself is critical of Alexander's behaviour in this instance (IV.7. 29-31). He

¹To avoid excessive footnotes, the references to Curtius have been indicated in the text itself.

speaks of Alexander's arrogance and hints at a later consequence: a strained relationship between the king and his Macedonian soldiers. These effects, however, are not noticeable in the decisive battle between Alexander and Darius. Curtius emphasizes the calmness of the king even on the evening of the battle (IV.13.16), and again his courage and bravery in the battle itself (IV.16.1ff.).

Book V describes how the great cities of Babylon, Susa and Persepolis fall into Alexander's hands. Darius, himself, to Alexander's great indignation, is murdered by two of his own commanders. During his continued success Alexander shows his generosity and kindness towards the captive relatives of Darius (V.2.18-22) and extends his help and compassion to the ill-treated Greek prisoners, whom he has freed at Persepolis (V.5.5 ff.). Shortly afterwards, Curtius evaluates Alexander's many excellent virtues (V.7.1f.). But he also indicates at the same time how a dark shadow has fallen on the king's character: his fine traits of endurance, activity, honour and clemency are sullied by his insuperable passion for wine. Thus it can happen that the advice of a drunken harlot leads to the wanton destruction of Persepolis (V.7.3-5).

In books VI and VII the narration of Alexander's military exploits is continued. The Macedonian army marches through Parthienê to Hyrcania. King Bessus is defeated, Bactria reached and the river Oxus is crossed.

During all these events, however, there are many incidents that indicate the deterioration in the relationship between the army and its leader. Alexander's eloquence can still arouse the soldiers for further conquests (VI.4.1), but there are numerous complaints. Curtius blames Alexander for the change in the attitude of his soldiers (VI.2.3).

Alexander, invincible in war, has now given in to leisure and pleasure (VI.2.1ff.). His newly acquired oriental tastes and habits are driving him in the direction of ostentatious pomp (VI.6.1-6). The Macedonians are offended by Alexander's change in behaviour (VI.6.11), and there are threats of conspiracies and mutinies. As a result two prominent Macedonian leaders, Philotas and his father Parmenion, are implicated and killed. Although Curtius seems to be uncertain as to the guilt of Philotas (VI.11.39) and tries to acquit the King of the murder-charge in the case of Parmenion,¹ Alexander is blamed for the use of torture (VI.11.40). Curtius' picture of Alexander at this time contrasts unfavourably with the one in the previous books. Alexander's high degree of suspicion, his secrecy and trickery do not correspond to his former trust and openness.

In book VIII Alexander's domineering arrogance is depicted as on the increase (VIII.1.22). Curtius describes the murder of Clitus as the outcome of quarrelling during a banquet (VIII.1.27ff.). He indicates the widespread disapproval among the Macedonians, caused by Alexander's wedding to Roxane, an oriental princess, (VIII.4.30) and by his scheming to be proclaimed a god (VIII.5.22-24).

The disapproval, however, does not end Alexander's military success. By means of clever strategy the Indus is crossed and king Porus defeated (VIII.13-14.).

The narration of Alexander's campaign in India is continued in

¹See Tarn's discussion of Curtius' attitude in his Alexander the Great, Vol. II, Appendix 12.

book IX. After some operations in the Punjab, the army protests against further progress, and Alexander reluctantly sanctions the decision to withdraw. However, he satisfies at last his longing to reach the Ocean. Leaving Nearchus to explore the Ocean with his fleet and to come back by sea, Alexander himself returns through the great deserts of Gedrosia, where the army suffers greatly from hunger and disease.

In his description of the campaign in India Curtius shows that, although the enthusiasm of the army has markedly decreased, Alexander's leadership meets many challenges successfully. But Curtius also notes Alexander's inclination toward senseless carousing and revelling, which goes hand in hand with cruelty. It causes Curtius to remark: nec luxuriae quicquam crudelitas neo crudelitati luxuria obstat (IX.10.30).

The great gaps in book X affect our knowledge of Curtius' continued narration. We do, however, hear that Alexander's schemes of universal conquest are hampered by outbreaks of mutiny, which are met by the king with harsh punishment. The existing text contains also the description of the death-scene in Babylon and of the intensive and extensive mourning after Alexander's death. A final appraisal of Alexander (X.5.26-37), which will be discussed later, concludes Curtius' narrative on the king although not the Historiae.

Throughout the Historiae Alexander is presented as the successful conqueror who believes in his own fortune and is supported by fortune. His tactical ability is seldom questioned, his own bravery and courage always evident. In Curtius' description, however, the character of Alexander changes, and a deterioration of his qualities takes place. The more prominent statements of Curtius on this change and on the

factors causing it may be indicated as follows:

In book III.6.17-20 the Roman writer offers an extremely favourable description of the young Macedonian king. Alexander is respected and admired by all, endowed with great mental and physical abilities, assisted by divine powers and supported by fortune. After this more comprehensive assessment of Alexander the first existing books of the Historiae record numerous examples of his noble and generous behaviour. Special praise is given to Alexander's moderation and clemency. These qualities are revealed on many occasions: in the king's behaviour toward the members of Darius' family (IV.10.23-24; IV.10.34; V.2.18-22), toward the women of Persepolis after the conquest (V.6.8), and toward the Persian nobility in general (VI.2.7-9).

A list of Alexander's virtues is offered again in book V.7.1ff. At this time, however, some criticism is added, and Alexander's passion for wine exposed. For Curtius the king's further degradation is greatly effected by the influence of oriental leisure and pleasures (VI.6.1-6). Alexander indulges in banquets, gambling, magnificent attire. The great warrior boasts in his cup and belittles his father (VIII.1.22ff.). After the murder of Clitus frankness in the presence of the king becomes impossible. Alexander orders or condones torture (VI.11.9; VII.5.40; VIII.8.20ff.), crucifies opponents (VII.11.28; IX.8.16) and indulges in massacres (VII.5.33; VII.9.22; IX.8.15).

In Curtius' narration Alexander's good qualities have not, however, entirely disappeared (VI.2.8). His clemency is not dead (VII.6.17), and his concern for his soldiers still alive (VIII.4.15-17). Luxury does not prevent the king from sharing the privations of his men (VI.6.16;

VII.5.9-12). Alexander tries to control his temper in the argument with Clitus (VIII.1.31ff.) and undergoes agonies of remorse after his murder (VIII.2.1-12.).

Clearly obvious, however, is Curtius' desire to show a progressive deterioration in Alexander, a deterioration which is caused by his great success. The author reflects on this development: scilicet res secundae valent commutare naturam, et raro quisquam erga bona sua satis cautus est (X.1.40).

The description of Alexander's character in the Historiae does not end on a negative note. Narrating the deep sorrow and regret of the former enemies over the death of the king, Curtius offers his own final evaluation (X.5.26-37). It is surprisingly positive. Emphasizing the greatness of Alexander and his many eminent virtues, he judges the king's faults in the light of his youth, and of the situation, in which fortuna had placed him. Curtius seems to realize that people will and have differed in their views of this extraordinary leader. To see Alexander in the right perspective--his faults and his outstanding qualities--seems to be the advice of Curtius to all those who are concerned about a fair judgment--juste aestimantibus regem (X.5.26).

The Alexander-portrait of Curtius defies easy classification. It does not offer a continuously harmonious view of the great king. This lack of harmony and coherence has caused some critics to distrust Curtius' ability and to pay little attention to his conception of Alexander.¹ Other scholars have been thinking simply and only in terms

¹Compare for example E. Schwartz, Griechische Geschichtsschreiber, 156-186.

of favourable or unfavourable characterization, as though all writers were propagandists of one kind or another determined to flatter Alexander or to vilify him. They have, for example, noticed Curtius' critical remarks exclusively and classified his portrait as very hostile to Alexander.¹ W.W. Tarn, in a reconciliation, has found in Curtius both an unfavourable as well as a favourable portrait, standing side by side.

Rarely has the suggestion been made, that Curtius--in his portrayal--might have attempted a synthesis of different views on Alexander.² These different views were available--as we have seen--in the variety of his sources and through the influence of possible contemporary discussions on Alexander. The idea of a synthesis does not appear to be absurd. On the contrary, in the face of divergent opinions, it would have been a very natural challenge for a writer to attempt a 'synthetic' view in the hope of providing a fairer evaluation of the phenomenon Alexander.³

If we assume, however, that Curtius had such an intention in mind, it should not surprise us to find that his 'synthesis' was not a complete success. He had no previous comprehensive interpretation of Alexander's character to fall back on.⁴ His source-material differed greatly. He

¹See W. Hoffmann, Das literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen, 62-68.

²H. Schönfeld in his commentary to Q. Curtius Rufus, Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen, Lateinisch und Deutsch, München, 1954, does make such a suggestion. The 'Peripatetic portrait' that Tarn claims to have found in Curtius is not really a 'synthesis' but an explanation of the total change in the king. It is ultimately hostile to Alexander. For a discussion of Tarn's opinion see Chapter IV in this study.

³Compare Curtius' request for a 'justa aestimatio' (X.5.26).

⁴See the pertinent remarks by L. Pearson, op. cit., p. 17.

did not always take the time and may not have had the critical acumen to separate the facts in his sources from the interpretation that accompanied them already. Both, therefore, found entrance in his work, side by side. In addition, Alexander's character was not an easy object for a comprehensive view. The greatness and variety of his achievements, the singular position which he had created for himself, all these provided for a wide range of different and contradictory experiences, which could not easily be merged. At the end of his work Curtius himself seems to have realized the unevenness in his presentation and the occasional lack of clarity in his description. As a result he offers his summary with its appeal for a fair evaluation and its emphasis on a proper perspective (X.5.26).

Curtius' portrait of the Macedonian king is obviously not a complete one. There is little information on Alexander's political thought and ideals. But here Curtius is only as guilty as the other ancient historians of Alexander are. Curtius, in fact, does not offer us a political but rather a psychological study of Alexander the Great. He describes how nature has endowed Alexander with brilliant virtues but also how the king is slowly infected with powerful vices. The struggle between virtue and vice takes place within the one personality of Alexander (V.7.1ff; VI.2.8). Since Alexander stands above all normal human standards in exercising his virtues, his vices have also an extreme effect on him--corruptio optimum pessima est.

What Curtius provides in his characterization seems to the present author to be not two opposite portraits of Alexander but a view of the polarity of his character. Such a view might have been enough

justification for Curtius to use different sources side by side without further explanation. For him there was, in fact, greatness in Alexander, which expressed itself in his many noble actions, but there was also growing pride and an increasing lack of moderation. Curtius does indeed emphasize a progressive depravation of Alexander's character, but the struggle is never really over. For any of his readers who might have received this impression Curtius offers the final balanced view (X.5.26ff.), which has been cited above.

In Tarn's opinion Curtius' view is simply careless and contradictory. To solve the apparent contradictions he imposed upon Curtius' description the structure of a so-called 'Peripatetic' portrait of Alexander.¹ In addition, he assumes the existence of a secondary portrait in the Historiae. Tarn's 'Peripatetic' portrait, however, does not fit, since Curtius describes no sudden and overwhelming change in Alexander and proclaims no complete deterioration of his character after the death of Darius. Curtius' final appraisal of the king cannot just be called a mere contradiction or stultification.² Its author intends it to be a fair and comprehensive evaluation. Its significance is based on its function to provide balance and perspective in the judgment of Alexander.

The passage in book X.5.26ff., however, is not Curtius' only endeavour to present a balanced approach to Alexander. The reader who

¹Tarn's hypothesis of a 'Peripatetic portrait' is discussed in Chapter IV.

²See Tarn, Alexander the Great, Vol. II, p. 100.

expects to find in the Historiae only extreme hostility toward the Macedonian king should look at some of Curtius' attempts to extenuate even Alexander's notorious actions. For example, in the tragic dissension between Clitus and Alexander, Clitus is given much of the blame. His 'procaciter ortus sermo', his 'animi prava contentio', generally his 'omnia inconsulte et temere iacta' as well as his 'violentia et ira' and his 'linguae intemperantia' (VIII.1.32-45) could not but challenge the king severely: iam tantum irae conceperat rex, quantum vix sobrius ferre potuisset (VIII.1.43). Then follows Curtius' description of Alexander's remorse and deep regret. He hurls no accusation against Alexander but reflects instead on the weakness of all men, including his own: male humanis ingeniis natura consuluit, quod plerumque non futura, sed transacta perpendimus (VIII.2.1).

In his moving description of the arrival and the previous sufferings of the mutilated Greek captives (V.5.5-24) Curtius makes the revenge of the victor on the city of Persepolis understandable. The reference to the Persian cruelties in their campaign against the Greeks under Xerxes is meant to provide another excuse for Alexander's behaviour against Persepolis (V.6.1).

Alexander's passion for wine, which according to Curtius destroyed many of his eminent qualities (VI.7.1), is attributed to his youth. On Curtius remarks later that advanced age might have cured it (X.5.35).

The Roman author also emphasizes the decisive influence that the degenerate habits and fashions of the orient have exercised on Alexander's degradation (VI.2.1-4; VI.6.1-12). His description, however, implies criticism not only of Alexander alone. It is rather an analysis of

their corruptive effects even--or especially--on a great man like Alexander.

Curtius' use of antithesis 'virtus--fortuna' has been interpreted by critics as a prominent device to discredit the Macedonian king.¹ In their opinion Curtius minimizes Alexander's achievement by contributing most of it to his fortuna (or felicitas).²

The antithesis 'virtus--fortuna (ἀρετὴ - τύχη)' and the question of their influence on human affairs was a well-known theme in ancient historiography and biography.³ It was used in the debate on the causes of success and disaster in the lives of peoples and individuals. Philosophy and rhetoric contributed to this debate. It is highly probable that the career of Alexander furnished a favourite example in this discussion.⁴ Plutarch's essay περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τύχης ἡ ἀρετῆς confirms this assumption.

In Roman literature this antithesis occurs rather frequently, and the role of fortuna in the lives of men is discussed on many occasions.⁵ Famous Roman leaders, for example Sulla and Caesar, are shown

¹Compare E. Schwartz, Griechische Geschichtsschreiber, 169-170. and W. Hoffmann, Das literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen, 66-68.

²The term 'felicitas' is occasionally used for 'fortuna', e.g. in VII.7.28 and IV.14.19.

³See G. Herzog-Hauser, RE, II-7, 1948, s.v. "Tyche", 1663 ff.

⁴See the discussion in Chapters III and IV.

⁵A survey is offered by A. Nordh, "Virtus and Fortuna in Florus," Eranos, L, (1952), 111-128.

as placing great confidence in their fortuna.¹ Cicero congratulates Caesar for possessing fortuna and felicitas as well as virtus.² On another occasion he points out that the great Roman generals have received their command not only because of their virtus but also because of their fortuna.³ Livy in his well-known comparison between Alexander and Roman leaders attributes fortuna to both parties.⁴ To the Romans, therefore, the influence of fortuna would not ipso facto discredit one's achievement. In a particular case much would depend on the specific meaning of fortuna.

In Curtius no precise definition of fortuna is offered.⁵ Fortuna and virtus are merely described as factors responsible for Alexander's actions. At times the victories of the king are attributed mainly to his virtus (IV.16.27). Then again fortuna is seen as the more important cause for Alexander's great success (VIII.10.18).

The final evaluation in book X refers again to the antithesis 'virtus--fortuna'. After a lengthy comment on Alexander's numerous positive qualities, his fortuna is charged with the responsibility for his faults. Remembering the growing depravation of Alexander, Curtius confesses the increasing influence of fortuna on the king as compared to

¹Compare H. Ericcson, "Sulla Felix," Eranos, XLI, (1943), 57-89. and Ericcson, "Caesar und sein Glück," Eranos, XLII (1944), 57-69. See also Alexander's belief in his fortune, Curt. VIII.7.28; VI.9.1; VII.11.27.

²Cic. Marc. 19.

³Cic. Manil. 47.

⁴Livy IX.18.8-19.

⁵Most frequently, fortuna is used by Curtius in a sense closely approximating that of Destiny to indicate both good-fortune and ill-fortune.

the strength of his virtus (natura). As if to reaffirm the greatness of the king, however, he explains how fortuna also helped in his many successes.

The ascription of virtues to 'natura' and faults to 'fortuna' takes Curtius but a little way towards explaining Alexander. There is a lack of preciseness in the use of his terms and a possible lack of control over his sources. One gains the impression that Curtius has not been able to handle the traditional antithesis well enough to express clearly the polarity of Alexander's character. We might remember, however, that the antithesis 'virtus--fortuna' was predominantly philosophical in nature and scarcely suited to express a psychological insight.

There is no evidence suggesting that Curtius used it as a favourite design to show his 'presumed' hostility toward Alexander. He does indeed state that fortuna exercised a negative influence on the king. But he also calls Alexander the only mortal being who had control over fortuna--quam solus omnium mortalium in potestate habuit (X.5.35).

Did the fact that Curtius was a Latin writer have any impact on his work, especially on his portrait of Alexander? Was Curtius, when writing his history, influenced by events, tendencies and problems from contemporary history. Schönfeld offers an affirmative answer to these questions when he states:

Es schreibt ja doch wohl kein ernsthafter Schriftsteller (und dieses Prädikat verdient Curtius durchaus) ein grösseres oder auch kleineres Werk zur Historie, ohne dass er dabei nicht auch, bewusst oder unbewusst, die Zeiten mit hinein verarbeitet, die er erlebt hat oder noch erleben zu müssen befürchtet.¹

¹H. Schönfeld in his commentary to Q. Curtius Rufus, Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen, p. 813.

Any identification of such an influence in Curtius, however, is difficult if not impossible. Since we have only questionable information on Curtius and the date of the Historiae, we lack a starting point in our search for contemporary parallels or references. Even the one definite reference to the situation in the Roman Empire is presented in such a rhetorical and metaphorical style as to permit a variety of interpretations. Still, scholars have continued to look for passages and modes of expressions in the Historiae that would reveal the Roman viewpoint of the author and help in identifying him. All suggested references, however, lack the preciseness and clarity necessary for a definite identification.

For example, Korzeniewski believes that the Historiae was written during the rule of Augustus. He is convinced that the negative features in Curtius' portrait of Alexander refer to Antony, whereas the positive characteristics indicate Octavian.¹ In his criticism of this suggestion A.B. Breebaart remarks rightfully:

Die Ähnlichkeit zwischen den Vorwürfen Antonius und Alexander gegenüber, zeigt nur die schemenhafte Art solcher Anklagen gegen nach dem Osten geneigte Herrscher; die genannten vitia sind alle schon in der hellenistischen Alexander-historiographie zu Hause.²

It is true, as has been mentioned above, that Curtius places a strong emphasis on the corrupting effect of oriental vices. The example of Antony's behaviour, however, is not the only possible reason for such a viewpoint. Under Caligula, Claudius, and especially under Nero, the

¹See D. Korzeniewski, Die Zeit des Q. Curtius Rufus, 75-78.

²A.B. Breebaart in Mnemosyne, XVII (1964), p. 433.

Roman imperial court had come under strong oriental influence.¹ The introduction of oriental customs and modes of life during the reign of all these emperors might have influenced Curtius' view and added emphasis to his criticism in the Historiae.

Although there is no direct evidence which shows that Curtius' characterization of Alexander was influenced by his own experience, the possibility of such an influence cannot be denied. Describing the virtues and faults of Alexander, the temptations and dangers inherent in his absolute and powerful position, Curtius could not but be aware of the behaviour and the fate of his own emperors. This awareness found apparently no expression in exact parallels. Curtius' audience might have needed but general resemblances in situation to draw their own conclusions.

Two misconceptions have influenced the modern estimate of Curtius Rufus and have affected the status of his work. Curtius has been looked upon as a writer whose exclusive aim was 'entertainment', and whose work is distinguished by its rhetoric and imaginative embroidery alone. He has also fallen victim to the fallacy that proclaims that a portrait of Alexander could be conceived in either favourable or unfavourable terms only.

There is no doubt that Curtius wanted to entertain, and that he can tell a story well. He had an inkling of the romance inherent in so

¹For evidence see A. Alföldi, "Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells," MDAI (R), XLIX (1934), 1-118, and Alföldi, "Insigne und Tracht der römischen Kaiser," MDAI (R) L (1935), 1-158.

courageous an invasion of the tempting but perilous orient, and his incidents are telling and exciting. Rhetorical erudition does indeed prompt him to over-indulge frequently in lengthy and imaginative descriptions. His main interest, however, centers around the person of Alexander, and the portrait which emerges is not a rhetorical and purely imaginative picture but a serious and genuine attempt to describe him.

Curtius could not deny that there were ugly incidents in Alexander's life, and that in all of them a large share of the blame rested with the king. The narration of these incidents, however, does not turn his characterization into an extremely hostile portrait of Alexander. Curtius is concerned with the whole Alexander, and he attempts to find the right perspective in explaining the polarity in the king's character. He is aware that the greatness in Alexander can cause admiration, and his weakness and violence shock and dismay.

Curtius' History of Alexander as an early example of a Latin prose work not directly concerned with a Roman orientation is a testimony of the awakening cosmopolitan interest of the Roman people. It also demonstrates again that the Romans of the Early Empire did have a special interest in Alexander. Livy had defied this interest by his appeal to the patriotic sentiments of his country-men. Seneca and Lucan condemned it by condemning the memory of Alexander. Curtius, at last, offered a direct look at Alexander, at his eminent virtues and his powerful vices, and at the struggle between these in his soul. This look does frequently present psychological illustration rather than historical insight. It is, however, an evaluation that seems to come more from Curtius himself than from a philosophical school or contemporary political criticism.

CONCLUSION

In the preface to his history of Alexander the Great, which was published in Germany in the year 1940, J. Gregor expresses confidence that his conception of Alexander will find a favourable response.¹ He has described the Macedonian king as "Träger einer Idee" and as "Architekt einer neuen Ordnung". Gregor expects that the people of his time with their own attempt to build a new empire and their own dedication to a great idea will have a deep understanding of such a view of Alexander.

Nine years later, after the end of the 'Third Reich', Fr. Schachermeyr wrote his book: Alexander der Grosse. Ingenium und Macht.² In writing this book Schachermeyr was profoundly influenced by the contemporary history of Central Europe. His Alexander is a conception which would have been unlikely before Hitler and World War II. Schachermeyr's Macedonian king is in many ways "a ruthless mystical-minded Führer".³

Both modern authors disagree widely in their conception of Alexander, and their disagreement has been caused by the influence of contemporary views and experiences. The Romans of the Early Empire have also differed in their conception of the Macedonian leader. The historical situation in Rome, the political and philosophical ideas and

¹See J. Gregor, Alexander der Grosse. München, 1940, 13-14.

²Fr. Schachermeyr, Alexander der Grosse. Ingenium und Macht. Wien, 1949.

³See A.R. Burn's review of Schachermeyr's book in CR, LXV (1951), p. 101.

tendencies prevalent during that time have likewise been factors in the Roman evaluation of Alexander the Great.

Very seldom did Roman writers attempt to offer a comprehensive view of Alexander. They presented rather partial assessments of him, that were motivated by and corresponded to their own contemporary experience. In this way the memory of the king was frequently made to serve specific Roman interests and concerns. The variety of these interests resulted necessarily in divergent approaches to Alexander.

To the first Roman emperors, Alexander the Great symbolized the idea of monarchial and universal rule. Having achieved this rule for themselves, the emperors signified and emphasized their imperial position by evoking the memory of Alexander's name and career. As to the manner and the extent to which the Alexander-ideology was employed, the early rulers differed greatly--from the dignified and restrained homage of Augustus to the showmanship of Caligula and Nero. The response to the imperial Alexander-imitation among the Romans seems at times to have paralleled the esteem in which the emperors were held in Rome. Whereas praise to Augustus by the poets of his time was expressed with reference to Alexander, criticism of Nero's rule by Seneca and Lucan was concealed in vigorous charges against the Macedonian king.

The acquaintance of the Romans with Alexander's name and their interest in his achievements is well attested for the time of the Early Empire. Alexander's career furnished many examples for Valerius Maximus' collection of Facta et Dicta Memorabilia. Some of his military exploits were described by Frontinus and praised by Velleius Paterculus. In the first 'universal' history written in Latin, Pompeius

Trogus assigned a prominent place to the description of Alexander's conquests. For Livy, too much honour was given to the Macedonian king. In his excursus on Alexander (IX.16-19) he feels obliged to restore Rome's prestige in the face of the mounting praise offered to Alexander's abilities.

For the development of a hostile attitude toward Alexander, the influence of the rhetorical schools and the different philosophical movements have been held mainly responsible. To assess this influence on the Roman portrait of the king has proven to be difficult. The debate on Alexander in the rhetorical as well as within the philosophical schools is not an isolated Roman phenomenon but reaches back into Hellenistic times. In addition, the incidental nature of the few existing references does not allow far-reaching and definite conclusions.

It is certain that Alexander was a favourite subject for debates in the rhetorical schools of Rome. His great desire to conquer unknown worlds is frequently referred to as one of Alexander's significant characteristics. It is admired at times but also interpreted as an indication of Alexander's megalomania. As such it appears frequently in the Alexander-critique of Seneca and Lucan.

The different philosophical schools debated on Alexander within the framework of their ethical systems and theories. The Cynics and Stoics seem to have looked upon the king as an example of extreme 'τῦφος', who was far inferior to their own idea of a 'virtuous' man. The Peripatetic school discussed the role of 'τύχη' in Alexander's career, grading the strength of his 'ἀρετή' accordingly.

Whether the philosophical discussions along these lines developed

into consistent but separate Cynic-Stoic or Peripatetic portraits of Alexander is questionable. The evidence does not seem to be strong and detailed enough to warrant such a conclusion.

Reflections of these discussions, especially those within the Stoic school, however, can be observed in the writings of Seneca and Lucan. The content and form of their critique on Alexander owes much to the influence of rhetorical debates and philosophical traditions. The vehemence and vigour with which it is expressed needs further explanation. The political situation in Rome has been suggested as the 'inner' motive that triggered Seneca's and Lucan's violent attacks on Alexander the Great. In the person of the Macedonian king the character and the rule of Nero was criticized and denounced.

Roman evaluations of Alexander should not necessarily be classified as being either favourable or unfavourable in their characterization of him. In this study Curtius' Historiae is seen as an attempt to create a portrait of the king that emphasizes the polarity of his character and thus has room for the whole Alexander.

Notwithstanding the weaknesses in his work, Curtius' attempt deserves attention and should secure him a unique position within the chorus of Roman voices on Alexander.

We have seen that to the Romans the memory of Alexander was not merely part of a historical tradition that they had received and in turn would simply transmit again. The character and career of the Macedonian king created strong interest among them, were discussed and evaluated, praised and criticized. As a result the portrait of Alexander in the

Early Empire did not remain static but was inevitably modified. A study of these modifications often adds little to our understanding of the historical Alexander but reveals the many different interests and purposes that his image and memory served among the Romans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. ORIGINAL SOURCES

The Greek and Latin texts used are from the editions of the Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teuberiana. Exceptions are mentioned in the annotations to the text.

English translations from the Greek and Latin texts are taken from the respective editions of the Loeb Classical Library, London and New York.

B. BOOKS

Benoit-Mechin, J. Alexander the Great. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1966.

Biéber, M. Alexander the Great in Greek and Roman Art. Chicago: Argonaut Inc., 1964.

Bishop, J. Nero - The Man and the Legend. New York: Barnes & Comp., 1964.

Bonner, S. F. Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1949.

Bowersock, G. W. Augustus and the Greek World. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

Clarke, M. L. Rhetoric at Rome. London: Cohen & West, 1953.

Coplestone, F. History of Philosophy. Westminster, M. D.: Newman Press, 1960, Vol. I.

Dudley, D. R. A History of Cynicism. London: Methuen, 1937.

Duff, J. W. A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age. 2nd. ed. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1960.

Ehrenberg, V. Alexander and the Greeks. Oxford: Blackwell, 1938.

Grant, M. Roman Literature. London: Penguin Books, 1964.

Hadas, M. A History of Latin Literature. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1952.

- Höistad, R. Cynic Hero and Cynic King. (Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man). Uppsala: Lund Blom, 1948.
- Hoffmann, W. Das literarische Porträt Alexanders des Grossen im griechischen und römischen Altertum. Leipzig: Teubner, 1907.
- Instinsky, H. U. Die Siegel des Kaisers Augustus. Baden-Baden: B. Grimm Verlag, 1961.
- Jason, T. Latin Prose Prefaces. Acta Universitatis Stockolmensis, VIII. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964.
- Klotz, A. Livius und seine Vorgänger. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1964.
- Kroll, W. Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1924.
- Leemann, A. D. Orationis Ratio. Vol. I. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963.
- Meyer, H. D. Die Aussenpolitik des Augustus und die Augusteische Dichtung. Köln: Bohlau-Verlag, 1961.
- Millar, F. A Study of Cassius Dio. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Momigliano, A. Claudius, The Emperor and his Achievement. Translated by W. D. Hogarth. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934.
- Morford, M. P. O. The Poet Lucan. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.
- Norden, E. Antike Kunstprosa. Vol. I, reprint. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1958.
- _____. Die römische Literatur. 6th. ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1961.
- Pearson, L. The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great. Philological Monographs XX. Amerc. Philological Assoc. 1960.
- Peter, H. Die Geschichtliche Literatur über die Römische Kaiserzeit. Vol. I. Leipzig: Teubner, 1897.
- Pohlenz, M. Die Stoa. (Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung.) Vol. I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Rose, H. J. A Handbook of Latin Literature. New York: Dutton & Co., 1960.
- Schanz, M., and Hosius, J. Geschichte der Römischen Literatur. Vol. I, 3rd. ed. München: O. Beck Verlag, 1913.
- Scott, K. The Imperial Cult under the Flavians. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936.

- Schwartz, E. Griechische Geschichtsschreiber. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1959.
- Seel, O. Die Praefatio des Pompeius Trogus. Erlangen: Universitätsbund, 1955.
- Starr, Ch. G. Civilization and the Caesars. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1954.
- Syndenham, E. A. The Coinage of the Roman Empire. London: Spink, 1952.
- Tarn, W. W. Alexander the Great. Vol. II. Cambridge: University Press, 1950.
- Taylor, L. R. The Divinity of the Roman Emperor. Philological Monographs, I, Amer. Philological Assoc. 1931.
- Treves, P. Il Mito Di Alessandro E La Roma D'Augusto. Milan-Naples: Ricciardi, 1953.
- Trillitzsch, W. Senecas Beweisführung. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.
- Turner, E. G. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XXV. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1959.
- Walsh, P. G. Livy - His Historical Aims and Methods. Cambridge: University Press, 1961.
- Wehrli, F. Die Schule des Aristoteles. (Texte und Kommentar), Vol. IV. Basel: Schwabe & Co., 1949.
- Wilhelm, F. Curtius und der jüngere Seneca. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1928.

C. ARTICLES

Abbreviations used correspond to those found in 'Marouzeau'.

- Aalders, G. J. D. "Germanicus und Alexander der Grosse," Historia, X, 1961, 382-384.
- Alexander, W. H. "Seneca's Ad Polybium De Consolatione. A Reappraisal," Transact. Royal Soc. of Canada, XXXVII, 1943, 33-55.
- Alföldi, A. "Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik," MH. VII; VIII; IX; X; XI, 1950-1954.

- Alföldi, A. "Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells," MDAI (R), XLIX, 1934, 1-118.
- _____. "Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser," MDAI (R), L, 1935, 1-158.
- Anderson, A. R. "Heracles and his Successors," HSPH, XXXIX, 1958, 7-58.
- Anderson, W. B. "Contributions to the Study of the Ninth Book of Livy," TAPhA, XXXIX, 1908, 89-103.
- Badian, E. "The Eunuch Bagoas," CQ, LII, 1958, 144-157.
- Balsdon, J. P. V. D. "Gaius and the Grand Cameo of Paris," JRS, XXVI, 1936, 152-160.
- Bardon, H. "Quinte-Curce," LEC, XV, 1947, 3-14; 120-137; 193-220.
- Bellinger, A. "The Immortality of Alexander and Augustus," YCIS, XV, 1957, 93-102.
- Bickel, E. "Politische Sibylleneklogen," RhM, XCII, 1954, 193-228.
- Bieber, M. "The Portraits of Alexander the Great," PAPhS, XCIII, 1949, 373-427.
- Bonner, S. F. "Lucan and the Declamation Schools," AJPh, LXXXVII, 1966, 257-289.
- Breebaart, A. B. Review, Mnemosyne, XVII, 1964, 431-433.
- Brown, T. S. "Callisthenes and Alexander," AJPh, LXX, 1949, 225-248.
- Burkis, A. A. "The Sources of Plutarch's *περὶ τυχῆς*," Phoenix, IV, 1950, 59-69.
- Charlesworth, M. P. "Nero: Some Aspects," JRS, XL, 1950, 69-76.
- Christensen, H. "Alexander der Grosse bei den römischen Dichtern," Neue Jahrb. für das klass. Altertum, XII, 1909, 107-132.
- Curtius, L. "Ikonographische Beiträge zum Porträt der Römischen Republik und der julisch-claudischen Familie," MDAI (R), XLIX, 1934, 119-156.
- Deonna, W. "La Légende d'Octave-Auguste," RHR, LXXXIII, 1921, 38-57; 163-195.
- Doblhofer, E. "Zum Augustus-bild des Horaz," RhM, CVII, 1964, 325-339.

- Due, Steen O. "An Essay on Lucan," C & M, XXIII, 1962, 68-132.
- Ericcson, H. "Sulla Felix," Eranos, XLI, 1943, 57-89.
- _____. "Caesar und sein Glück," Eranos, XLII, 1944, 57-69.
- Fink, R. O. "Victoria Parthica and Kindred Victoriae," YCIS, VIII, 1942, 81-101.
- Fisch, M. H. "Alexander and the Stoics," AJPh, LVIII, 1937, 59-82.
- Fuhrmann, M. "Die Alleinherrschaft und das Problem der Gerechtigkeit," Gymnasium, LXX, 1963, 481-514.
- Gage, J. "La theologie de la victoire imperiale," RH, CLXXI, 1933, 1-43.
- Gigon, O. "Interpretationen zu den antiken Aristoteles-Viten," MH, XV, 1958, 147-193.
- Glaser, K. "Curtius und Claudius," WS, LX, 1942, 87-92.
- Hammond, M. "The Sincerity of Augustus," HSPH, LXIX, 1965, 139-162.
- Hanslik, R. "The Augustusvita Suetons," WS, LXVII, 1954, 99-144.
- Hansen, G. Chr. "Alexander und die Brahmanen," Klio, XLIII-XLV, 1965, 351-380.
- Helms, R. "Valerius Maximum, Seneca und die 'Exemplasammlung'," Hermes, LXXIV, 1939, 130-154.
- Heuss, A. "Alexander der Grosse und die politische Ideologie des Altertums," Antike und Abendland, IV, 1954, 65-104.
- Hoffmann, W. "Livius und die römische Geschichtsschreibung," Antike und Abendland, IV, 1954, 170-186.
- Ivanka (von), E. "Zur Selbstdeutung des römischen Imperiums," Saeculum, VIII, 1957, 17-31.
- Koestermann, E. "Die Mission des Germanicus im Orient," Historia, VII, 1958, 331-375.
- Magie, D. "The Mission of Agrippa to the Orient in 23 B.C.," CP, III, 1908, 145-152.
- Marti, B. M. "The Meaning of the Pharsalia," AJPh, LXVI, 1945, 352-376.
- Mensching, E. "Peripatetiker über Alexander," Historia, XII, 1963, 274-282.

- Merlan, Ph. "Isocrates, Aristotle and Alexander the Great," Historia, III, 1954-55, 60-81.
- Mette, H. J. "Roma (Augustus) und Alexander," Hermes, LXXXVIII, 1960, 458-462.
- Norden, E. "Ein Panegyricus auf Augustus in Vergils Aeneis," RhM, 1899, 466-482.
- Nordh, A. "Virtus und Fortuna in Florus," Eranos, L, 1952, 111-128.
- Nutting, H. C. "The Hero of the Pharsalia," AJPh, LIII, 1932, 44-52.
- Pfister, F. "Alexander der Grosse. Die Geschichte seines Ruhmes im Lichte seiner Beinamen," Historia, XIII, 1964, 37-79.
- Pfligersdorffer, G. "Lucan als Dichter des geistigen Widerstandes," Hermes, LXXXVII, 1959, 344-377.
- Salmon, E. T. "The Evolution of Augustus' Principate," Historia, V, 1956, 456-478.
- Sanford, E. M. "Nero and the East," HSPH, XLVIII, 1937, 75-103.
- _____. "Lucan and the Civil War," CP, XXVIII, 1933, 121-127.
- _____. "The Eastern Question in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*," Classical and Medieval Studies presented to E. K. Rand. New York: Butler Hall, 1938, 255-264.
- Schönberger, O. "Zu Lucan. Ein Nachtrag," Hermes, LXXXVI, 1958, 230-239.
- Schönfeld, H. "Curtius in alter und neuer Sicht," appendix to Q. Curtius Rufus, Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen. Lateinisch und Deutsch, München: Heimeran Verlag, 1954.
- Scott, K. "Tiberius' Refusal of the Title 'Augustus'," CP, XXVII, 1932, 43-50.
- Steele, R. B. "Quintus Curtius Rufus," AJPh, XXXVI, 1915, 402-423.
- Stroux, J. "Die stoische Beurteilung Alexanders des Grossen," Philologus, LXXXVIII, 1933, 222-240.
- Swain, J. W. "The Theory of the Four Monarchies--Opposition History under the Roman Empire," CP, XXXV, 1940, 1-21.
- Tarn, W. W. "Alexander, Cynics and Stoics," AJPh, LX, 1939, 41-70.
- Taylor, L. P. "Tiberius' Refusal of Divine Honours," TAPhA, LX, 1929, 87-101.

Volkman, H. "Antike Romkritik, Topik und historische Wirklichkeit," Gymnasium, Beiheft 4, 1964, 9-20.

Wardman, A. E. "Plutarch and Alexander," CQ, XLIX, 1955, 96-107.

Wilcken, U. "Alexander der Grosse und die indischen Gymnosophisten," SDAW, XXIII, 1923, 150-183.

Zuntz, G. "Zu Alexander's Gespräch mit den Gymnosophisten," Hermes, LXXXVII, 1959, 436-440.

The following articles from Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, ed. by Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., and Kroll, W. were consulted.

Herzog-Hauser, G. RE, Suppl. IV, 1924, s.v. "Kaiserkult," 821 ff.

_____. RE, II-VII, 1948, s.v. "Tyche," 1663 ff.

Klotz, A. RE, II-XXI, 1952, s.v. "Pompeius Trogus," 2301 ff.

Laquer, R. RE, II-XI, 1936, s.v. "Timagenes," 1064 ff.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Korzeniewski, D. Die Zeit des Quintus Curtius Rufus, Dissertation, Universität Köln, 1959.

Nadell, J. B. Alexander and the Romans, Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1959.

Woolsey, R. B. Pompeius Trogus History of Alexander the Great, Dissertation, Yale University, 1950.

B29875